# BROWNSON'S

# QUARTERLY REVIEW.

## APRIL, 1847.

ART. I. — *The Two Brothers; or, Why are you a Protestant?* — Continued.

V. PROTESTANT controversialists are well hit off in Lessing's Fable of the *Poodle and Greyhound*. "'How our race is degenerated in this country!' said one day a far-travelled poodle to his friend the greyhound. 'In those distant regions which men call the Indies, there is still the genuine breed of hounds, — hounds, my brother, (you will not believe it, and yet I have seen it with my own eyes,) who do not fear to attack the lion and grapple with him.' 'Do they overcome him?' asked the prudent greyhound. 'Overcome him! Why as to that I cannot exactly say; but only think, a lion attacked!' 'But,' continued the greyhound, 'if these boasted hounds of yours do not overcome the lion when they attack him, they are no better than we, but a great deal more stupid.'" Only think, the Church attacked! Attack her boldly, with or without success, and you are sure of the admiration of all — the poodles.

When the infamous Danton was asked by what means the pitiable minority he headed were able to maintain their Reign of Terror and paralyze the millions opposed to them, he answered, — "By audacity, *audacity*, AUDACITY." Protestant leaders understand very well the advantages of audacity, and that, if one is only bold and unprincipled enough to throw out grave charges against the purest and noblest cause which ever existed, he will not fail of multitudes to credit him. Groundless objections, if not susceptible of an easy or a popular refutation, are as much to their purpose as any. They serve to

attack the lion, to put Catholics on their defence, and that is the same as a victory. A child may start an objection which the ablest and most learned divine cannot answer — to the child. A very ordinary man may urge an objection to some article of faith which will demand, in him who is to receive the answer, as well as in him who is to give it, for its refutation, the most rare and extensive erudition, and familiarity with the deepest principles and nicest distinctions of scholastic theology and philosophy. No small part of the objections urged against the sacred mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, the Real Presence, and Transubstantiation, are objections which an ordinary mind may understand, but which it is impossible to answer to the general reader, — especially if the general reader be a Protestant. Such objections are exactly to the purpose of the Protestant controversialists, and gain them the applause of — the poodles.

These controversialists it is not to be presumed are ignorant that all the objections of past and present times to the Church have been refuted, and unanswerably refuted; but, from the nature of the case, they have, in numerous instances, been refuted only to the professional reader. The nature of the objection, though itself popular, precluded a popular reply. In all such cases, Protestant controversialists have only to deny that any reply has been given, or to assert that the one given is inconclusive, and they come off triumphant. This is their common practice. Nothing is more common than to meet, in Protestant controversial works, objections, which have been refuted a hundred times, reiterated without a hint that any reply has ever been even attempted, and urged in a tone of confidence, as if Catholics themselves conceded them to be unanswerable. The impudence of Protestant polemics in this respect is notorious and undeniable.

That this method of conducting a controversy, on matters in which no one has any real interest in being deceived or in deceiving, is fair, honorable, or just, it is not presumed any Protestant is silly enough to pretend; but, filled with an inveterate hatred of the Church, and having decided that it is the church of Antichrist, Protestant leaders, apparently, regard themselves at liberty to make use of any means for its overthrow which promise to be successful, and have no scruple in resorting to artifices which would shock the moral sense of an ordinary heathen. The Catholic writer, who should give a faithful account of their nefarious conduct in their war

on the Church, would find it harder to sustain himself with his friends than against his enemies ; and he would hardly fail to be condemned by his own communion as a calumniator. Their conduct is so foreign to all the habits and conceptions of a simple-minded, honest Catholic, that one needs to have been a Protestant a great part of his life to be able to conceive it possible for beings having the human form, and pretending to some respect for religion and morals, to be guilty of so wide a departure from all that is true, just, and honorable. Hence the great tenderness and forbearance with which Catholics usually treat Protestants, and the undeserved credit they are accustomed to give them for a partial degree, at least, of fairness and candor.

At first view, one is at a loss to account for the sudden rise and rapid spread of the Protestant rebellion in the sixteenth century. Knowing by infallible faith, that the Church is of God, the Immaculate Spouse of the Lamb, and that she has truth, wisdom, justice, sanctity, reason, evidence, on her side, the Catholic is astonished at so singular a phenomenon ; but as he penetrates deeper into that mystery of iniquity, and becomes familiar with the character of the rebel chiefs, and the means they adopted, his astonishment ceases, and his wonder is, not that the success was so great, but that it was not greater, — that the revolt was so soon arrested and confined within limits that it has not as yet been able to pass. He sees nothing marvellous in the success of these rebel chiefs, but he is struck with the manifest interposition of Divine Providence to confound their language, to divide their counsels, to defeat their plans, to arrest their progress, to protect his Church, to show his unfailing love for her, and to augment her power and glory. Protestantism, as it concerns Europe, is actually confined within narrower limits than it was fifty years after the death of Luther, while the Church has gone on enlarging her borders, and never at any former period was the number of the faithful so great as it is now.

They who attack existing institutions, especially if those institutions are wise and salutary, may always count on the admiration and applause of all the poodles. Fixed and authoritative institutions are offensive to the natural man. They are a restraint, and no man, save so far as assisted and subdued by grace, loves restraint ; and there is no one that has not a natural repugnance to whatever curbs his lawless desires and licentious passions, or interposes an obstacle to his living

as he lists. In every community, — because in every natural man, — there is always a predisposition, more or less manifest, to rebel against the existing order, and to welcome and adhere to those who are prepared to war against it, especially to credit whatever may be advanced to its prejudice. They who attack the existing order, appealing to this predisposition, have the appearance of attacking tyranny and oppression, and of being champions of freedom and justice. This fact renders them respectable, almost sacred, in the eyes of the multitude. Their position, moreover, permits them to assume a bold and daring tone, to make broad and sweeping assertions, and to forego clear and exact statements, and close and rigid logic. They can declaim, denounce, be impassioned, and affect all the eloquence of virtuous indignation. The eloquence of denunciation is the easiest thing in the world to command; for it appeals directly to those elements of our nature which lie nearest the surface and which are the most easily moved, and weak men prefer it and seek to possess it.

But he who defends authority labors always under a disadvantage. He has an unpopular cause. To the superficial, — and they are always the great majority, — he is the advocate of tyranny, the enemy of liberty, warring against the best interests and true dignity and glory of his race. He can appeal to no popular passion, use no burning words, and pour forth no strains of indignant eloquence. He cannot speak to the multitude. He must speak to sober sense, to prudent judgment, and aim to convince the reason, instead of moving the sensibility, or inflaming the passions. His words, to all but the few, are cold and spiritless, tame and commonplace. For the foaming tankard or sparkling goblet, with which the popular declaimer regales his auditors, he has only simple water from the spring. He must be subdued in his tone, measured in his speech, exact in his statements, rigid in his reasoning, and few only will listen to him, and fewer still can appreciate him. He who for years has been on the side opposed to authority, and by his bold and daring declamation roused up a whole ocean of popular passion, and at every word brought an echo from the universal heart of humanity, no sooner finds himself on the other side, than all his marvellous eloquence is lost, and he is pronounced, by the very public which had hailed him as a second Cicero or Demosthenes, cold and weak, a Samson shorn of his locks and grinding in the mill of the Philistines. No matter how true and just his

thought, how deep and searching his wit, how wise and prudent his counsel, how lucid and exact his statements, how clear and cogent his reasoning, he can excite no passion, move no sensibility, and bring no popular echo. The spell is broken; his magic is over, and his power to charm is gone for ever. He is no Indian hound, fearing not to attack the lion, and the poodles see nothing to admire.

Then, again, the poodles regard the lion attacked as the lion vanquished. They hold every objection boldly and confidently made to be true, till it is proved to be false. In this fact, in the tendency of the great majority to regard every objection made to existing authority as well founded till the contrary is shown, lies the secret of the Protestant Reformation. To this the Reformers owed their brilliant success. They well understood that their objections to the Church would be credited by multitudes, till refuted. It was a matter of little importance, so far as their success was concerned, whether their objections were true or false. What they wanted was simply objections easily made, but not easily refuted, — susceptible of being proposed in a popular form, but not susceptible of a popular answer. Such objections they employed their wit in inventing, and their skill and activity in circulating. A lie, happily conceived, adroitly told, and well stuck to, was in their case hardly, if at all, inferior to the truth; and it must be conceded that they had a marvellous facility in inventing lies, and in adhering to them when they had once told them. Whoever coolly examines their objections to the Church will readily perceive that they are all framed with respect, not to truth, but to the difficulty of refutation, and on the principle that a lie is as good as the truth till it is contradicted. Gloriously did they chuckle, we may fancy, when the "Father of lies" helped them to a popular objection, to which no popular answer could be returned. Boldly, or with brazen impudence, they threw it out, sent it forth on its errand of mischief, and then laughed at the heavy answer which, in process of time, came lumbering after it. The objection was made in a few words, on a loose sheet, and wafted by the wind of controversy through every land, town, village, and hamlet, to every door, and became universally known; the answer followed in a ponderous quarto or folio, all bristling with scholastic formulas and scholastic distinctions, formidable even to the professional reader. Its circulation was necessarily limited; few only heard of it; fewer

read it; and still fewer were able to appreciate it. The authors of the objection safely ignored it, or, if they could not, they misrepresented it, denied its conclusiveness, and even made it the occasion of a new triumph with their followers. Or, when they could neither conceal the fact of the answer nor its conclusiveness, they could still count on all the poodles, who would insist that there must have been something in the objection, or else it would not have required so elaborate and so learned a refutation. The lion had been attacked, — and that was something.

"Where there is much smoke, there is some fire," says the popular proverb. Surely there must be something wrong in the Church, or so much would not, and could not, be said against her. Whether, therefore, the objections actually urged be precisely true or not, it is evident the Church is not unobjectionable, and if not unobjectionable, we are justified in rejecting her. So reason the poodles, — forgetting that our Blessed Lord himself was everywhere spoken against, was called a glutton and a drunkard, the friend of publicans and sinners, a blasphemer, a seditious fellow, a fool, said to be possessed of the devil, and finally crucified between two thieves as a malefactor. Here was smoke enough, — was there also some fire? Here were objections enough raised, charges enough preferred, — was there also some truth in them? Where is the blasphemous wretch that dare think it? If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more they of his household! If so they have accused the Lord himself, how much more his Church! To one competent to reason on the subject, the grave character and multiplicity of the objections alleged against the Church are an evidence that she is God's Church. "Will you tell me what books I may read to become acquainted with the Catholic faith?" said, the other day, an intelligent Protestant lady to the writer. "I am wholly ignorant of the Catholic Church, but I hear, everywhere, so much said against it, that I cannot help thinking there must be something good in it, and that possibly it is the true Church." This young lady, brought up a rigid Calvinist, through God's grace, had learned to reason far more justly than she had been taught by her Protestant masters, and, if true to the grace she has received, will ere long be admitted into the "Communion of Saints." But she is not one of the poodles; and the Reformers preferred, and their successors prefer, the

admiration of these to the approbation of the sober and prudent greyhounds.

The policy of the Reformers was indicated by Luther, when he took the discussion of theological questions out of the schools and from the tribunal of professional theologians, and brought it before the unprofessional public. I picked up, the other day, in a steamboat, a flaming quack advertisement. It appeared that the advertiser had, as he alleged, discovered an entirely new medical system, which placed all the regular mediciners, from Æsculapius down, quite in the wrong. He had challenged the regular practitioners to a discussion of the merits of their respective systems. The challenge had been accepted, but on condition that the discussion should be before a jury of medical men. The advertiser scorned this condition. It proved that the "regular doctors" had no confidence in their own system; for if otherwise, they would not shrink from a public discussion. It was an insult to the public, and he would not submit to it. He was ready and anxious to discuss the question; but he would do it before no prejudiced jury of professional men; he would do it openly before his free and enlightened fellow-citizens, who were the only proper tribunal. He trusted his fellow-citizens, the free and enlightened public, would appreciate his motives in refusing to be a partner in offering so gross an indignity to their intelligence and impartial judgment, and would be at no loss to understand why the regular practitioners had annexed to their acceptance of his challenge so insulting a condition.

Now here am I, said I to myself, throwing down the advertisement, at least a fair average of the popular intelligence. I have even studied, with considerable attention, several branches of medical science; and yet how utterly unqualified I should be to sit as judge on the respective merits of rival systems! I might listen to the statements of either party, but I am too ignorant of the general subject to be able to perceive the bearing and real value of the statements of one or the other. I might, indeed, if such should happen to be the case, perceive that this pretended discoverer silenced his opponent; but I could draw no inference from that, for nothing is more common than for a man to triumph through impudence, or because too ignorant to be refuted. The proper judges of a controversy like the one here proposed are medical men themselves, as lawyers are the proper judges of law questions. Indeed, the very fact, that this advertiser refuses to argue his

case before an audience of professional men, and appeals to the unprofessional public, is to me full proof that he is a quack, and sufficient to decide me, without further examination, against him. If I need medical advice, I am sure I shall not call him in, any more than I would a miserable pettifogger in an important and intricate law case. I can confide my health and that of my family to no practitioner whose science and skill are not superior to my own, and vouched for by those who know more of medical matters than I do, and are far better judges of medical systems than I am.

Just so would I have reasoned, if I had been present, when Luther made his appeal to the unprofessional public. Why did he make such appeal? Because the public at large are the proper tribunal for professional questions? Because they can really judge better, discriminate more accurately, and decide with more wisdom and justice, than they who by their profession are at least somewhat acquainted with the matters in controversy? Because he really believed them the best qualified to be judges? No one can be so simple as to believe it, so senseless as to pretend it. Luther knew that loose statements, confident assertions, bold allegations, and impassioned appeals would avail him nothing before a jury of theological doctors. He knew that there he could not lie with impunity, and that his "bellowing in bad Latin" would win him no laurels. He may have persuaded himself, or suffered the Devil to persuade him, — and if we may believe his own statements, his colloquies with the Devil were frequent and intimate, — that the Church was wrong; but he must have known that the particular objections he brought against her were groundless, and that it was only by disregarding the established rules of reasoning, and resorting to falsehood and sophistry, confident assertions and bold and daring denunciations, that he could sustain himself or his party. And these could avail only with the unprofessional public, who could never understand the exact points in question, perceive the bearing, or feel the force, of strict logical arguments. With them eloquence would pass for reason, and invective for argument. This he knew, and hence his appeal from the schools to the public at large. Hence have his followers continued to appeal to the multitude, and to leave truth and justice to take care of themselves.

This policy, however, is not without certain drawbacks. It answers admirably while the party adopting it have nothing

of their own, and are mere Bedouins of the desert, free to attack when and where they please. But when and where they have acquired a partial success, and wish to abandon their wandering life and predatory warfare, and settle down in fixed dwellings, with something established and permanent of their own, they find it unavailing. Men, as Carlyle remarks, cannot live without clothes, and surely in this bleak, wintry world it is not convenient to go naked. They must and will have something to cover their nakedness, — some sort of institutions for their protection. They will cover themselves with aprons of fig-leaves, and build them a hut with broken branches, seek out a cavern in the rocks, or a hole in the earth, if they can do no better. They must and will have something they call religion, some established mode of communion, real or not real, with the Invisible. Even the atheist fabricates to himself a god of nature, and renders it a species of worship, and the skeptic seeks to convert his skepticism into a creed. It is horrible to feel one's self alone in the world, abandoned to the blind workings of the elements, with no Father in heaven, no brothers on earth, standing on a mere point, surrounded by a universal blank. We cannot endure it. Nature recoils from herself, and the soul shrieks out, "O thou Great Unknown, save me from myself! leave me, O, leave me not to the solitude of my own being!" There is a God, and a God to be worshipped, is written in golden letters on all nature, and engraven as with the point of a diamond on every heart. In vain would man tear himself away from his Maker. Go where he will, be and do what he will, sleeping or waking, the God that made him and seeks his heart wooes him with his love, or pursues him with his justice. The boldest recoil from his justice, and quake before the undefined dread of his vengeance, and seek some medium of yielding the love, or of providing a substitute for the love he solicits.

Protestants went on gloriously, while they aimed at nothing but to attack the existing ecclesiastical order. The means they had chosen were just fitted to their purpose. But when a large number had been seduced from their allegiance, and found themselves homeless, and shelterless, and naked in this bleak world, a new class of wants sprung up to be provided for. Some substitute for what had been thrown away in their madness was to be sought out. Now their old arts and methods were useless. As soon as they had something with which they were unwilling to part, something, in a word, to defend,

the weapons they had forged were no longer adapted to their purpose, and could be turned against them with murderous effect. Thus short-sighted and self-destructive is iniquity ever.

Poor James experienced the truth of this, the moment he was called upon to answer why he was a Protestant. The question was a novel one, and he soon found that he was wholly unprovided with a satisfactory answer. He had sought long and earnestly for specious objections to the Church, but he had entirely neglected to furnish himself with arguments for Protestantism as distinguishable from Socinianism or infidelity. Nay, he was unable even to tell, save in a negative sense, what he meant by Protestantism. Adopt what definition he would, it would include either too much or too little. It was too bad. Yet his natural pride would not permit him to yield to the obvious truth, that he must either be a Catholic or reject all revealed, if not all natural, religion. With the multitude he might, indeed, sustain himself. There his audacity and his eloquence would serve him, but they were lost upon his cool and logical brother. John was no poodle, that was certain, and could never be made to regard the lion attacked as the lion overcome, or even to admire the rashness of an attack where there could be no victory. What was to be done? Give up the point? That would never do, and he the virtual chief of the Protestant league for the conversion of the Pope and the suppression of Popery! What then? Surely he was the equal of his brother in acquirements, and he had always, in their school days, been regarded as his superior in natural gifts. He would not believe that he had the weaker cause. His failure, thus far, must be owing to his yielding the management of the argument to his brother, and his not having been sufficiently on his guard against his sophistry and Jesuitical cunning. Could he not correct this? Could he not contrive to change the issue, and throw the burden of proof on the Catholic? He pondered the matter for several weeks, and finally concluded, that, if he could not define and establish Protestantism, he might at least disprove Catholicity, and thus justify the Reformers in separating themselves from the Church.

VI. As soon as James had come to this sage conclusion, an opportunity was found of renewing the discussion. This time it was John who opened it.

"Well, brother, he said, have you succeeded in finding a definition of Protestantism to your mind?"

"I wish to consider Protestantism, now, only as a protest against the errors and corruptions of Popery. Here you affirm and I deny, and consequently the laboring oar is in your hands."

"Not exactly, my prudent brother. You affirm Catholicity is corrupt. You are, then, the accuser, the plaintiff in action, and must set forth your charges and sustain them. The principle of law is, every man is to be presumed innocent till proved guilty. The Church must, therefore, be presumed innocent till the contrary is made to appear."

"The Church claims to be an ambassador from God, and to have the right to command me in his name. She must bring credentials from God, before I can be held to hear or obey her. I demand her credentials."

"All in good time. But not too many things at once. You shift the question before you get it fairly stated. You begin by charging the Church with being corrupt, and, without offering any proofs of her corruption, you proceed immediately to demand her credentials as the Ambassador of God. This will not do. Corruption implies integrity; and the plea that the Church is corrupt concedes her credentials, and merely charges her with exceeding her authority, or with having abused it. This plea concedes her authority; but the demand for credentials denies it. You cannot, therefore, plead, at one and the same time, want of authority, and corruption or abuse of authority. You must elect one or the other, and confine yourself to the one you elect."

"I am no lawyer, and do not understand special pleading."

"But you are an educated man, and are to be presumed to understand, at least, the ordinary rules of logic, and therefore that the same thing cannot be both conceded and denied in the same breath. You cannot say that the Church is corrupt, has abused or misused her authority, and yet deny her authority. When you deny that she has ever received authority from God, you declare her, *in quantum est Ecclesia*, a nullity from the beginning, and to allege the corruption of a nullity is absurd."

"Be it so. The Romish Church never received authority from God, or, in other words, was never divinely commissioned."

"Possession is in law *primâ facie* evidence of title. The

Church is in possession, and has been so from time immemorial. The presumption is, therefore, in her favor, and you must admit her title, or set forth good and valid reasons for contesting it."

"Prescription does not apply in the case of the Church."

"It is admitted in law, and therefore, by the reason of mankind, as a general principle. If you deny its application in the case of the Church, you allege an exception to the general rule, and must show a reason for it."

"Prescription does not give an absolute title, but simply a presumptive title against adverse claimants. It presupposes the existence of the estate to be conceded, the title of which is vested in some one, and presumes it to be in the possessor, unless the contrary is shown. But where the existence of the estate is the matter in question, it is idle to plead possession or prescription. What is not cannot be possessed. The estate, in the present case, is the divine commission. Supposing it conceded that such a commission has at some time been issued, possession may, I grant, be pleaded as *primâ facie* evidence of title in the possessor. But I deny that such a commission as the Romish Church claims to have received has ever been issued. You must prove, therefore, the fact of such commission, before you can plead possession or prescription."

"Possession implies the object possessed. Evidence of the possession is, therefore, evidence of the existence of that which is possessed. Consequently, just in proportion as there is evidence that the Church has possessed, or claimed and exercised, with the general consent, the commission in question, and as her having claimed and exercised it with this consent is presumptive proof of title against adverse claimants, is there presumptive proof that the commission has been issued."

"*Quod nimis probat, nihil probat.* Your argument, if it prove any thing, proves too much. A pagan or a Mahometan may say as much."

"If either paganism or Mahometanism claims a similar commission, and can, as the Church, be said to be in possession, the fact is, in like manner, presumptive evidence of title till the contrary appears, I both concede and contend. Nothing can generate nothing. The claim to a divine commission must have had some origin, and, on the principle of law, that every man must be presumed innocent till proved to be guilty, must be presumed to have had a good origin till

the contrary is proved. False religions imply the existence of the true religion, as counterfeit coin implies the genuine. The claim to divine commission, if it be really made by either paganism or Mahometanism, is therefore *primâ facie* evidence that at some time, to somebody, a divine commission has issued. If no such commission had ever been given, it is not conceivable that it could have been claimed. No one would ever have falsely claimed to be an ambassador from one court to another, if no genuine ambassador, or nothing in the same order, had ever been known or heard of; and the sending of ambassadors must have become a general custom, before any one, not duly commissioned, could have conceived the project of palming himself off as one, or could have hoped for any success in the attempt to do it. The fact of possession, where it could be pleaded, would be a presumption of title in the Mahometan or the pagan, in like manner as it is in the case of the Catholic. Hence the Church, where she has never been in possession, when presenting herself as an *adverse claimant*, always produces her credentials, and gives good and valid reasons why the present occupant should be ousted and she placed in possession. I admit, therefore, all that the argument implies, and deny that it proves too much."

"But admit it, and every mad enthusiast who claims to be divinely commissioned must be presumed to be so till the contrary is shown."

"Not at all. His claim to a divine commission is, if you will, a presumption that at some time, to somebody, a divine commission has issued; but not that it has issued to him; for he is not and never has been in possession. He must show a reason for *his* claim, before it can be admitted."

"At least, the principle applies to Protestants as well as to pagans and Mahometans, and you can no more plead prescription against us than against them."

"I have admitted the plea of prescription, in the case of paganism and Mahometanism, on the supposition that they are really in possession, — a fact, however, which I let pass, but do not concede. But Protestants cannot plead prescription, because they are not and never have been in possession, and because they do not even claim to be, since you, in their name, deny that the commission in question has ever issued."

"But conceding that there was a presumption in favor of the Church at the epoch of the Reformation, and that the

Reformers were not at liberty to separate from her without cause, this cannot be said now. The Church is not now in possession. The Reformers gave good and valid reasons for separating from her communion, and she has been condemned as a usurper by the judgment of mankind. The question is not now on ousting her from a possession which she has held from time immemorial, but on reversing the judgment rendered against her, and readmitting her to a possession from which she has been ejected by due process of law."

"When was the judgment you speak of rendered? and where is the record of the court?"

"The fact is one of public notoriety, and all the world now laughs at the ridiculous pretensions of Rome."

"Do you include in *all the world* the pagan and Mahometan worlds?"

"Why should I not?"

"It may be doubted whether the question has really ever come before them in such a shape that they can be said to have pronounced judgment upon it; and as they reject Protestantism, whenever it pretends to be Christian, no less than Catholicity, they might possibly be as unsafe witnesses for a Presbyterian as for a Catholic, — perhaps even more so."

"Let them go. I mean by *all the world* all the Christian world, Christendom so called."

"You mean to assert, then, that Christendom has pronounced judgment against the Catholic Church?"

"Yes, against the *Romish* Church."

"You distinguish without a difference. The Church in communion with the Church of Rome, acknowledging its Pontiff for its supreme head on earth, is the only Church which, by the consent of mankind, is or ever has been denominated the *Catholic* Church."

"She should be denominated the mother of harlots."

"So that Protestant communions could claim to be her daughters. But no more of this. Have Catholics, who remain in her communion, pronounced judgment against the Church?"

"Perhaps not."

"And they are as two, if not three, to one of all who bear the Christian name."

"I am sorry to say they are."

"And I am not sorry, and would to God there were none but Catholics on the earth!"

" That is, you would, if you could, exterminate all Protestants."

" Yes, if making them sincere and humble Catholics were exterminating them. But if Catholics are the great majority of Christendom, how can you tell me that Christendom has pronounced judgment against the Church ? "

" I do not reckon Papists among Christians."

" And I regard what you call Papists as the only true Christians ; and I have, to say the least, as much right to my reckoning as you have to yours. You mean, then, by Christendom those who protest against the Church ? "

" You may have it so."

" Then your position is, the Church is condemned by all by whom she is condemned ! This may be granted. But these are a small minority, a mere handful, of those who bear the Christian name. By what right do you pronounce their judgment the judgment of mankind ? "

" Protestant nations are the more enlightened and advanced portion of mankind."

" Is that a conceded fact ? "

" Is it not ? "

" Do Catholics concede it ? "

" Perhaps not."

" They are the great majority, and, as they deny it, how can you put it forth as generally conceded ? "

" The denial of Catholics amounts to nothing, — the fact is as I allege."

" In whose judgment ? "

" In the judgment of all who are competent to judge in the premises."

" Who says so ? "

" I say so."

" On what authority ? "

" The fact is evident, and cannot be questioned."

" But it is questioned and denied by Catholics, who are as five to one to your Protestants."

" They will swear to any thing their priests tell them. Their denial is not to be counted. They are not to be permitted to testify in their own cause."

" As much as you in yours. Their denial is as good as your assertion, till you show some reason why your assertion is to be preferred."

" I tell you Protestant nations are the most enlightened and advanced portion of mankind, as is well known."

"To whom? To themselves?"

"Yes, if you will."

"By what right are they both witnesses and judges in their own cause?"

"By the right of being the most enlightened and advanced portion of mankind."

"What is it to be truly enlightened and advanced?"

"Those nations are the most enlightened and advanced that are the most enlightened and advanced in what is of the greatest importance and utility to man."

"And what is that?"

"Religion, the 'one thing needful.'"

"True religion, or false?"

"True religion, of course."

"The most enlightened and advanced nations are, then, those who are the most enlightened and advanced in the requirements of true religion?"

"They are; and therefore I claim Protestant nations as the most enlightened and advanced."

"And therefore beg the question. If Protestantism be the true religion, you are right; if Catholicity be the true religion, you are wrong. Consequently, you must determine which is the true religion, before you can determine which are the more enlightened and advanced nations."

"But it cannot be denied that Protestant nations are more intelligent, more industrious, and better instructed in the science and art of government."

"What you say may be questioned; but even conceding it, it amounts to nothing. Because a man is a good cobbler it does not follow that he is a good sculptor. Because a nation is enlightened in mere earthly matters, it does not follow that it is in religious matters. It would be a solecism to say the Athenians were a more enlightened and advanced nation than the Jews, or that a Socrates is better authority on religion than David, Solomon, or Isaias."

"But I have always considered it undeniable that Protestant nations are in advance of all the others."

"If to advance consists in shaking off Christian civilization and in returning to that which it superseded, you may have been right; otherwise, the probability is, that you have been altogether wrong. You must prove Protestantism to be true religion, before you can claim Protestant nations as the more enlightened and advanced nations; and till you can so claim

them, you cannot claim their judgment as the judgment of mankind, even if you could then; and till you can claim their judgment as the judgment of mankind, you cannot say the judgment of mankind has condemned the Church. This you have not yet done. Consequently, you cannot say the Church has been ejected from her possession by the judgment of mankind. She is, as it appears, from the fact that the overwhelming majority of those who bear the Christian name continue, as they have always continued, to adhere to her, still in possession. She has lost nothing, and you have gained nothing, by the lapse of three hundred years. The question stands to-day as it did in 1517, and she may plead the *olim possideo*, as she could then, and with even additional force; and you must set forth in your declaration good and valid reasons for ejecting her, before you can compel her to plead any other title than that of prescription."

"But you forget that the Reformers did set forth such reasons."

"I cannot have forgotten what I never knew. But whatever reasons they set forth, the presumption is that they were insufficient; for they have been so regarded by Christendom generally, since the Church continues in possession, and the great majority of all who are called Christians still adhere to her communion."

"But they were in reality sufficient, and ought to have been so regarded."

"That is a point to be proved. What were those reasons?"

"The first in order, if not in time, was, that our Lord founded no authoritative church such as the Romish claims to be."

"We have seen she was in possession, and the presumption was in her favor. What you state was an allegation which needed to be proved."

"The Reformers proved it."

"By what evidence?"

"By the word of God."

"Had they the word of God?"

"They had."

"Did the Church concede that they had it?"

"They had the Holy Scriptures, and she admitted that they were the word of God."

"That the mere letter was the word of God, or the sense in which the Holy Ghost dictated them?"

"The sense, of course; for words are nothing without their sense."

"Did she admit that the Reformers, in having the letter of Scripture, had its sense, which is the word of God?"

"She did not."

"Was, according to her, the Holy Scripture the word of God, if understood in any sense different from hers?"

"No; she claimed the right to declare its sense."

"Did the Reformers adduce the words of Scripture, in support of their allegation that our Lord had founded no such church as she pretended to be, in the sense she gave them?"

"They did not; for she explained them in her own favor."

"Then she did not admit that what they adduced in support of their allegation was the word of God. Then, as the burden of proof was on them, they were bound to prove that it was his word."

"They quoted the Scriptures, and they were the word of God."

"In the sense of the Church, not otherwise. The Reformers pleaded the word of God in support of their allegation. The Church replied by denying that what they set forth as the word of God was his word. Her reply was sufficient, unless they proved that it was his word."

"But their plea was evident on its face, for they alleged the very words of Scripture."

"That they alleged the very words of Scripture may be denied, for in point of fact there are no words of Scripture which say that our Lord did *not* found such a church as the Catholic Church claimed and claims to be; but let that pass for the present. They pleaded the word of God, and the word of God is not the words, but the sense, of Scripture. To adduce the words, therefore, availed them nothing, unless they proved that the sense of the words, as intended by the Holy Ghost, was what they pretended; for till then they could not assert that they had adduced the word of God."

"But the matter was so plain, that there could be no question as to the genuine sense of the words adduced."

"But there was a question as to the sense, by your own admission. The Church attached to them one sense, and the Reformers another."

"But the words themselves necessarily mean what the Reformers asserted."

"We cannot go into that question at present. The right to declare the word of God is included in the possession of the Church, and the fact that she denied the Reformers' sense is *primâ facie* evidence in her favor and against them."

"I do not admit that."

"You have admitted it; for you have conceded that prescription was in favor of the Church, and is *primâ facie* evidence of title. You must, therefore, admit the word of God as the Church declares it, till you can assign a good and valid reason for not doing so."

"The fact that the express words of Scripture are against her is such a reason."

"The express words of Scripture you cannot allege; because, as a matter of fact, no such words are to be found; and because, if there were such words, they still could not be adduced against the Church, for the Scriptures are in her possession, and denied to have authority save as she understands them."

"That would be to deny that the Scriptures are legitimate evidence in support of an allegation against the Church."

"That is not my fault. The Reformers could not, of course, legitimately quote the Scriptures as the word of God against the Church, save in the sense she authorized, unless they succeeded in removing the presumption she derived from prescription, and in getting themselves in legal possession of them."

"I do not admit that. The Scriptures were the law, to which the Church and all were accountable."

"As declared by the Church, *transeat;* but that they were the law in any other sense the Reformers were bound to prove."

"But the Reformers had the word of God as well as the Church, and therefore were not bound, even presumptively, by the sense she declared."

"Had they *legal* possession of the word of God?"

"I care nothing about that. They had the Scriptures, and that was enough; for they had in them the rule of faith, both for them and for the Church."

"But you must care for that; for it is conceded that the Church was in possession, and, being in possession, she had the presumptive right to declare the law; and they were bound to take it from her, unless they could prove that they had legal possession of the word."

"They received the Scriptures from God himself."

"They were, then, the legal depositaries of the word?"

"Yes, as much as the Church."

"Had they the right to declare its sense?"

"Why not?"

"If you say that, you concede the point you dispute. You allege against the Church, that our Lord founded no such church. The essential character of the Church, so far as concerns the present controversy, is, that she has the word of God, and is its legal keeper and expounder. If, then, you say the Reformers had legal possession of the word, and were authorized to keep and expound it, you make them essentially such a church as you assert our Lord did not found. You contest the claims of the Church on the ground that our Lord founded no church with the authority she exercises; you must, then, unless you would concede what you deny, disclaim that authority on the part of the Reformers."

"I do disclaim it on their part."

"Then you grant, in the outset, that they had no legal possession of the word, and were not its authorized keeper and expounder; therefore, that they had no word of God which they had authority to quote against the Church. What they had not they could not adduce. Consequently, they did not, for they could not, adduce the word of God in support of their allegation."

"But they had the Scriptures, as a matter of fact, and could read and understand them for themselves."

"They had the Scriptures as a private citizen has the statute-book, it may be; but as they were not the authorized keeper and expounder of the word of God, their understanding of it was without authority, and not to be entertained."

"They had the right from God himself to read and understand the word for themselves."

"Then they were authorized to keep and expound it, at least for themselves."

"They were."

"But I understood you to deny that any body was authorized to keep and expound the word."

"I do not say so. Almighty God, in revealing his word, has authorized every one to keep, read, and expound its sense."

"Then, so far from its being true, as you have alleged, that our Lord has founded no church with the authority the Catholic Church claims, he has constituted each individual a

church with the same authority. Decidedly, brother, you must give up this, or withdraw your allegation. If you admit that our Lord has anywhere authorized any body, individual or collective, to keep and expound the word of God, you admit that he did found, essentially, such a church as your allegation denies. You cannot deny such authority to the Church on the ground that no such authority was ever given, and then claim it for each and every individual."

"Be that as it may, I do claim it for each and every individual."

"That is a bold stand for a Presbyterian, but necessity sometimes compels us to be bold. But did the Church admit this?"

"No, she denied it."

"Then the Reformers were bound to prove it."

"They did prove it."

"By what authority?"

"The word of God."

"By what the Church admitted to be the word of God?"

"No matter what she admitted. They proved it by the word itself."

"Who says so?"

"They said so."

"On what authority?"

"On the authority of God's word."

"On what authority did they say that that was the word of God which authorized them to say so?"

"The word itself."

"But by what authority did they prove the word itself?"

"The word of God *is* the word of God, and is in all cases supreme. Would you deny the word of God?"

"But as the Church denied what they adduced as the word of God to be his word, they were then bound to prove that it was his word."

"What did Almighty God give us his word for, if it was not that we should read and understand it for ourselves?"

"Your first business is to prove that he has given *you* his word. The Church asserts that he has given it to *her*, and that she permits the faithful to read the Scriptures for their edification, but always with submission to her authority, and the reservation that no doctrine is to be deduced from them which she does not authorize."

"There she is wrong."

"That is for you to prove."

"God proposed to teach mankind by writings, not by a body of men."

"That, also, is for you to prove."

"It is evident from the word itself."

"You must prove that *you* have the word, before you can introduce it as evidence."

"No one can read the New Testament and believe otherwise."

"Not true in fact; for the great mass of all who do read the New Testament actually believe otherwise. But you must get legal possession of the New Testament, and establish your right to interpret it, before you can quote it in a sense the Church denies. Till then, the denial of your assertion by the Church is *primâ facie* evidence against you."

"I do not care for the Church. I deny her authority."

"I know that; but her authority is to be presumed, till reasons are set forth for denying it. You are not at liberty to deny it without a reason."

"I have given a reason."

"What is it?"

"Why, I tell you she is condemned by the word of God."

"You *tell* me so, but that is not enough. You must *prove* that it is so."

"You do not suffer me to do so. You will not suffer me to quote the Bible against her."

"No such thing. When you have proved that the Bible, in the sense you adduce it, is the word of God, you may quote it to your heart's content."

"Why, I have told you again and again that the Church herself admits the Bible to be the word of God, and therefore it is not necessary, in arguing against her, to prove that what I adduce from it is the word of God."

"The Bible *plus* her interpretation, or rather in the sense she authorizes, she admits to be the word of God, I grant; *minus* that interpretation, or in any other sense, she denies it to be the word of God. Consequently, since you would adduce it in a sense she does not authorize, if you adduce it at all, she denies what you would adduce is the word of God. You must, then, prove that it is, before you can legally adduce it."

"But you will not let me prove it."

"I do not hinder you."

"I offer to prove it by the word itself."

"That is not logical; for it *assumes* the word to prove the word."

"Not so. Here are the Scriptures, admitted by the Church, when taken in their genuine sense, to be the word of God. I simply propose from them and by them to show what is their genuine sense; and if I do so, I prove by an authority which she herself concedes all that I am required to prove."

"You cannot do that, because in doing it you assume that the Church is not the authorized interpreter of the word, which is the point you must prove; and that you are the authorized interpreter, which is also a point you must prove. The Church simply admits that the Scriptures, taken in the sense she authorizes, are the word of God. This is the full extent of her admission. But taken in another sense, she denies them to be the word of God; for the word of God, as we have agreed, is not the words, but the sense, of the Scriptures. Consequently, before you can allege them in a sense contrary to hers, nay, before you can go into any inquiry as to their sense, you must, on the one hand, dispossess her of her prescriptive right to declare their sense, and establish your own authority as their interpreter. Till you have done one or the other, the sense of Scripture is not an open question, and you cannot open it without assuming the point in dispute."

"That denies absolutely my right to quote the Scriptures against the Church."

"Not absolutely. You may quote them in her sense against her, if you can; and in your own sense, when you have proved it to be the word of God."

"But the first would be of no avail, because she has taken care to explain the Scriptures in her own favor; and I cannot prove them to be the word of God in any other sense, unless I am at liberty to explain them by themselves."

"That is, you cannot prove your point, unless you are at liberty to prove the same by the same! Prove that you are authorized to declare the sense of Scripture, and then you will have no difficulty."

"But I cannot prove that I am, save from the word itself."

"That is to say, unless you are at liberty to assume and exercise the authority to declare the sense of Scripture, as the

condition of proving that you have such authority! That will not do, brother. It would be proving *idem per idem*, the same by the same, which is bad logic."

"How, then, am I to proceed?"

"That is your affair, not mine."

"The Church spreads her claim over every thing, and leaves me, according to your principles of logic, no possible means of adopting any line of argument against her, which does not, in some sense, assume the point to be proved. So subtle and crafty is her tyranny, that it leaves absolutely nothing to those who would resist it. This to me is only another evidence of her wicked origin and pernicious influence."

"So you are of opinion, that, if Almighty God should establish a church, he would take good care to leave it open to attack, to give its enemies a fair and solid ground on which to carry on their operations against it! I am of a different opinion, and predisposed to believe the Almighty to be more than a match for the Devil, and that, if he should establish a church, he would so constitute it that no attack could be made upon it which should not recoil upon those who made it, — no argument be framed against it which should not serve to demonstrate the folly and absurdity of its framers. It is unquestionably a very difficult matter to make an action lie against the Church, or to find a court in which an action can be legally commenced against her; but I have yet to learn that this is her fault. The Church is in possession of universal and supreme authority under God, has a *prescriptive* right to that authority, and must be presumed to have a *valid* right to it till the contrary is shown. You cannot *assume* the contrary, but are bound to *prove* it. Now, you must prove it without authority, or with authority. Without authority you cannot prove it; for proofs which are sustained by no authority prove nothing. You must, then, prove it with authority, or not prove it at all. That it is difficult to find any authority whose assertion does not assume the nullity of the supreme authority which is to be presumed, is undoubtedly true. You wish to arraign the actual possessor of the supreme authority, but you cannot do so unless you have some court of competent jurisdiction. But any court which should claim authority to issue a precept against the possessor of supreme authority, and summon him to answer at its bar, would assume authority over him, and by so doing prejudge the case.

This is in the nature of things, and cannot be avoided; but whose is the fault? The Reformers, if they had been lawyers, would have seen that what they attempted was against law, and a *primâ facie* crime on their part, for which they were liable to suffer the full vengeance of the law. If they had been even tolerable logicians, they would have seen that they could urge no argument which did not assume what was in question. But surely the Church is not to be censured, because they were miserable pettifoggers and shallow sophists."

"But there is a court competent to institute proceedings against the Church."

"What court?"

"The court of conscience."

"You must prove that conscience is supreme, before you can say that; for the Church, as the vicegerent of the Almighty, claims and possesses jurisdiction over conscience, and is supreme judge *in foro conscientiæ*. This is an integral part of her possession to which she has a prescriptive right. You must dispossess her, before you can compel her to plead at the bar of conscience."

"But she is at least bound to answer at the bar of the Bible, interpreted by private reason."

"Not till you dispossess her, or place the Bible interpreted by private reason in possession; for she possesses jurisdiction over them."

"At the bar of reason, then."

"Reason has and can have no jurisdiction in the premises; for the question turns on a supernatural fact, lies within the supernatural order, and therefore out of the province of reason."

"The general sense of mankind."

"That is against you, and in favor of the Church, as we have already seen, and is conceded in the fact that the Church is allowed to plead prescription."

"Then to the written word, interpreted and its sense declared by the Holy Ghost."

"Establish the fact of such a court, and she will not refuse to appear and answer. But she claims to be that court herself, and is in possession as that court; you must dispossess her by direct impeachment of her claims, or by establishing, before a competent tribunal, the rights of an adverse claimant, before you can allege such a court."

"The Reformers were aided by the private illumination of

the Holy Ghost, and what they did, they did in obedience to his commands."

"That was for them to prove."

"They did prove it."

"How?"

"From the written word."

"But they could prove nothing from the written word, for they had no legal possession of it."

"They had legal possession of it. The Holy Ghost gave them legal possession."

"What and where was the evidence of that fact, if fact it was?"

"In the Scriptures."

"That is, they proved by the Holy Spirit that they had legal possession of the Holy Scriptures, and by the Holy Scriptures that they had the Holy Ghost! But this was to reason in a *vicious circle.*"

"The Reformers set forth other and conclusive reasons for rejecting the Church, which I will reproduce on another day; but you must excuse me now, for I have some parochial duties to which I must attend."

"So you give up the first reason, namely, our Lord founded no such church as the Catholic?"

"Not by any means. I may have erred in bringing that forward before the others. I ought not to have departed from the example of the Reformers. They did not allege that reason first, and I see now that they were wise in not doing so. They first proved that the Church had forfeited her rights, by having abused her trusts. Having thus ejected her, they took possession of the word, and easily and clearly demonstrated that she had been null from the beginning, by showing that our Lord never contemplated such a church."

"That is, they dispossessed themselves by acquiring possession. Very good Protestant law and logic."

"You may spare your sneer, for perhaps it will soon be retorted with seven-fold vengeance."

"O, not so bad as that, I hope."

"We shall see. I will, God willing, prove that the Reformers were rigid reasoners and sound lawyers."

"An Herculean task. Clearing the Augean stables was a fool to it."

"The Reformers were great and glorious men, rare men, the like of whom will not soon be seen again."

" Some consolation in that."

" To call such men miserable pettifoggers and shallow sophists is ——"

" To use soft words, which turn away wrath."

" To outrage common sense and common decency."

" Why, would you censure me for not calling them by harder names ? I might have easily done so, but I wished to spare your prejudices as much as possible."

" I tell you, John, that, in becoming a miserable idolatrous Papist, and drunk with the cup of that sorceress of Babylon, the mother of every abomination, you seem to have lost all sense of dignity, all self-respect, and all regard for the proprieties of civilized life."

" Because I do not rave and rant, every time I have occasion to allude to the chiefs of the Protestant rebellion ? "

" No ; you know that is not what I mean. You degrade yourself in speaking so contemptuously of the glorious Reformers."

" And what does my most excellent, amiable, polite, and sweet-spoken brother do, when he calls God's Holy Church the sorceress of Babylon, &c., and brands the members of her holy communion with the name of idolaters ? "

---

Art. II. — 1. *Religious Dissensions : their Cause and Cure.* By Pharacellus Church. New York : Gould & Newman. 1838. 12mo. pp. 400.

2. *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church in* 1837, *including a full View of the recent Theological Controversies in New England.* By Zebulon Crocker, Delegate from the General Association of Connecticut to the General Assembly of 1837. New Haven : B. & W. Noyes. 1838. 12mo. pp. 300.

These works, published some nine years ago, may seem in these days, when all with our Protestant neighbours is in commotion and changes under the very eye of the spectator, to be quite out of date, and to have lost all their interest and importance for our contemporaries ; but if all with heretics is perpetually changing, all remains ever essentially the same. They are ever learning, and never able to come to the knowl-

edge of the truth ; ever seeking unity, and never finding it, — uniformity, but always departing farther from it, and involving themselves anew in the same old discussions and dissensions. These works are therefore, in reality, as fresh and as important as if they were still damp from the press, and may well be made the text for a few observations which we wish to offer on Protestant dissensions, and appropriately drawn upon for proofs and illustrations of those dissensions as they have been manifested in our own country, especially by the high-toned and arrogant Presbyterians, — the most bigoted and the most influential of all the sects in the United States

The dissensions and countless divisions, to which the so-called Reformation, by carrying out its fundamental principle of private judgment, has given birth, have been the standing reproach of Protestantism from its commencement, and must, assuredly, at no very distant day, lead to its total disorganization and ruin, unless some effectual means are soon discovered of bringing its discordant elements into harmony, or at least of retaining the *soi-disant* Evangelical sects under their respective standards of orthodoxy. Aware of their position, and alarmed by the progress of this cancer, which, under every conceivable form of dissent, eats into the vitals of the "glorious Reformation," the Evangelicals, from time to time, have devised various plans of harmony and union ; but every plan they have been able to devise has, thus far, proved utterly insufficient to arrest the evil they deplore.

The arrogant assumption of church authority by the original authors of the "godly Reformation" was resisted by subsequent innovators, who contended that they had as much right as any to read the Bible for themselves and exercise private judgment in the investigation of truth, and that they were at perfect liberty, when arriving at different conclusions, to reform the Reformation according to their own views of what the Gospel teaches. This right could not be denied without violating the cardinal principle of the Reformation itself, and its exercise has led to the formation of innumerable discordant sects among its deluded followers, each professing to be guided by one and the same infallible rule of faith, — "THE BIBLE, AND THE BIBLE ALONE." Finding, however, that the Bible alone — or rather the Bible as interpreted in Luther's Commentaries and Calvin's Institutes — was insufficient for the preservation of *the faith once delivered to the Saints*, — of the Reformed stamp, — they had recourse to "Confessions

of Faith," by subscription to which they hoped that both preachers and people would be held together in the bonds of peace. Vain hope! Their confessions of faith being composed by fallible men, and confessedly destitute of all claim to infallible authority, were only so many ropes of sand. They contained different doctrines and systems of church government, which it seemed impossible to reconcile with the essential unity of the ONE FAITH of the Gospel; and it became necessary, from time to time, to amend them, and, finally, to leave them to the private judgment of each individual, who, it was admitted, had a perfect right to examine for himself, and receive or reject each and every article, as it should or should not seem to him to harmonize with the "law and the testimony" to which he appealed. Under such circumstances, it was impossible to preserve unity of faith, and consequently the several sects were reduced to the extreme necessity of "agreeing to differ," not only one sect from another, but also as to the individual members of each, so long as they should hold what were termed, in general, the *essential* articles of the Christian faith. But even this expedient did not avail; for they could not agree among themselves what doctrines were to be held as essential to the soundness and integrity of the Christian faith. Hence it came to pass, that doctrines, held to be essential by one sect, were set aside by another as unessential; and even among the Evangelical denominations themselves, there is not one in which differences and dissensions do not obtain respecting what are considered *essential* doctrines, and parties are formed under the distinctive appellations of Arminian and Calvinistic, New School and Old School, High Church and Low Church, &c.

These sects and divisions create discord and dissensions in the Christian community, and not only disturb social order, but inevitably tend to destroy all faith in divine revelation; for, as Lord Bacon justly observes, — "Divisions in religion, where they prevail, are the cause of atheism." Such being the lamentable effects and tendency of sects and divisions among nominal Christians, it must be to the Protestant a subject of interest to investigate the cause of these scandalous dissensions, with a view to discover a cure before the evil becomes irremediable, and draws down upon our common country the curse of atheism, with all its dreadful consequences. To the Catholic the cause and cure of dissensions in religion are so manifest, that he can hardly conceive how men, who have read

the history of Protestantism, can be so blind as not to see them. But unfortunately, the Protestant commences the inquiry by taking for granted that the foundation on which his whole system rests is sound and of divine institution, and he looks elsewhere for the cause of the evil which he is desirous to eradicate. But though he may discover secondary causes, they are of such a nature, that even their removal — were that possible in our present fallen state — would not effect the cure of the spiritual malady under which his system labors, except at the sacrifice of all the prerogatives of divine truth, and the establishment of latitudinarian principles and practice, which would render divine faith a matter of no moment, — a word of no meaning.

The history of the dissensions in the Presbyterian Church in the United States is, with slight variation, the history of the schisms and divisions of other Reformed communions in this and other countries where they have prevailed; and it serves to exemplify and illustrate the remarks we have made on the general tendency of Protestantism. That we may not be suspected of partiality in our sketch, we shall avail ourselves of the authority of the Calvinistic author of the *Catastrophe* for our facts.

"The Presbyterian Church in the United States," says Mr. Crocker, "was originally composed of Presbyterians from Scotland and Ireland, and Congregationalists, chiefly from New England. The Congregationalists were, at first, the majority, and the two denominations united on the common ground of a belief in the great doctrines of the Bible, and of saving faith in Jesus Christ. This union was continued for a period of twenty-five years, without any written confession or form of government. In 1729, the synod of Philadelphia . . . . . passed an act, *not*, *however*, *without considerable opposition*, adopting the Westminster Confession of Faith with the Assembly's larger and shorter Catechism, 'as being, in all the *essential* and *necessary* articles, good forms of sound words, and systems of Christian doctrine.' By this act, a declaration of assent to the Confession and Catechisms was required, 'in all the essential and necessary articles,' by members of the synod and candidates for the ministry; at the same time it was provided, that, 'in case any minister of this synod, or any candidate for the ministry, should have any scruple with respect to any article or articles of said Confession or Catechisms, . . . . . the presbytery or synod shall, notwithstanding, admit him to the exercise of the ministry, . . . . . if they shall judge his scruple or mistake to be about articles *not essential and necessary*, in doctrine, worship, or government.' 'The synod also do *solemnly* agree, that none

of us will traduce or use any opprobrious terms of those that differ from us in those extra-essential and not necessary points of doctrine; but treat them with the same friendship, kindness, and brotherly love, as if they had not differed from us in such sentiments.' . . . . .

"Two facts are strikingly exhibited in the adopting act from which these quotations are made. One is, that *diversity of sentiment existed in the members of the synod of* 1729; the other is, that, in the exercise of a catholic [Protestant] spirit, they were ready to overlook minor differences of opinion, and make an agreement, *in substance of doctrine*, the basis of union. They declared, that 'we do not claim or pretend to *any authority* of imposing our faith upon other men's consciences; . . . . . and utterly disclaim all legislative power and authority in the Church, being willing to admit to fellowship in sacred ordinances all such as we have grounds to believe Christ will at last admit to the kingdom of heaven.' For nearly twenty years, the Congregationalists and Presbyterians, thus united, maintained general harmony; the exercise of Christian catholicism [Protestantism] preventing *serious* contentions and unhappy divisions. *A difference of views*, however, respecting presbyterial order and ministerial qualifications distinctly marked *two* parties in the Church; and *so widely did they differ in sentiment and feeling*, that there was needed only a sufficiently exciting cause to produce a *separation*. That cause was furnished by the labors of Mr. Whitfield. . . . . The strict Presbyterians regarded Mr. Whitfield and his friends as 'ignorant and extravagant enthusiasts.' The other party, called the *New Side* or *New Lights*, viewed their opponents as 'Pharisaical formalists.' Animosities increased, until the synod of Philadelphia, after *violent* controversy, was *rent asunder*, and two rival synods were formed, viz., New York and Philadelphia. . . . . .

"These synods, after remaining divided for seventeen years, at length, in 1758, were united. The evils which they had experienced by division taught both parties salutary lessons respecting forbearance and toleration; but *diversity of opinion on many important subjects was not removed.* The Scotch and Irish Presbyterians, and their descendants, in general, were *Old Side* still; while those of New England origin and sentiments were *New Side*, and almost as distinctly marked as ever. These two parties . . . . . have formed the basis of the two great parties which now divide the Presbyterian Church. The Old School and New School are the Old Side and New Side, — the old divinity and new divinity men of former times. The nucleus of each of the present parties not only existed in 1704, but has ever since existed, the same thing as ever, and now essentially determines the character of the agglomerated mass. . . . . Liberal Presbyterianism, being of New

England origin, and wearing the impress of New England sentiments, is the object of attack with the Old School party; and hence the present struggle in the Presbyterian Church relates primarily to New England opinions and influence. For the suppression of these opinions, and the removal of this influence, the majority of the General Assembly of 1837 adopted their revolutionary measures. Here is found the cause of the abrogation of the Plan of Union, and the proceedings connected with that act."—*Catastrophe*, pp. 47–53.

These extracts show, that, though the Presbyterians in this country commenced operations, in 1704, with the "Bible alone" as its standard of faith, it was still necessary, in 1729, to adopt a confession of faith, with a smaller and larger catechism. But as they "disclaimed all legislative power and authority in the Church," they very modestly agreed not to "traduce or use any opprobrious terms" of those that might happen to differ from them in "extra-essential and not necessary points of doctrine." As, however, they did not declare what points of doctrine were "essential and necessary," they left a very wide margin for men to agree to differ on, without forfeiting their claim to orthodoxy; but, at the same time, any point of doctrine on which they should happen to entertain different views might be represented as essential and necessary, and those who rejected it might be assailed and cut off from the communion of the Church, as guilty of denying fundamental articles of faith. We need not be surprised, therefore, to find that the Westminster Confession and Catechism, which they required the members of the synod and candidates for the ministry to subscribe and assent to, with certain reservations in compliment to the right of private judgment, proved insufficient to hold the members together in unity of faith. It is true, we are assured, that, by the exercise of a spirit of "toleration,"—to which the Catholic Church has been ever opposed in matters of faith, and which to call "Catholic" is a gross perversion of language,—ministers were allowed to put their own private construction on the articles, and expound them as they pleased, and no "*serious* contentions or unhappy divisions" occurred for nearly twenty years. Still there were *two* parties in the Presbyterian Church, "widely differing in sentiment and feeling," who applied to one another most opprobrious epithets, by which their mutual animosities were increased, and the synod, after a violent controversy, was rent asunder into two separate and rival synods. The separation lasted

seventeen years, after which the synod became reunited externally, though the elements of discord and dissension remained; and, notwithstanding the "Plan of Union," formed with the General Association of Connecticut in 1801, the New School divines and churches were finally, in 1837, declared by a majority of the General Assembly to be "out of the ecclesiastical connection of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and that they are not, in form or fact, an integral portion of said Church."*

The doctrinal disputes and religious dissensions that prevailed, and, to a considerable extent, still prevail, in the Presbyterian Church, clearly demonstrate the insufficiency of the "Bible alone" as the rule of faith, and that a "standard of orthodoxy" cannot give an exposition of doctrine which its adherents will feel themselves bound to receive in its integrity, but leaves them free to profess or reject particular points, so long as they adopt the whole as containing, in substance, "all necessary and essential" articles. To subscribe to the Confession of Faith, with these limitations, does not restrict the right of private judgment; for each individual minister and member is at perfect liberty to qualify or explain away any particular doctrine to which he may happen to take exception, and yet persuade himself that he has not rejected any necessary or essential point of doctrine, or set aside the authority, such as it is, of the confession of faith.

Acting on this principle, the New School divines, while professing the most unlimited obedience to, and confidence in, "the Bible alone," as the only rule of faith, deemed themselves justified in promulgating opinions at variance with some of the doctrinal views of the confession of faith, which they believed to be repugnant to Scripture. But, though neither the Bible nor the Confession of Faith designated any particular articles of faith as essential, the divines of the Old School did not hesitate to pronounce their doctrines *heretical*, as containing fundamental errors concerning essential and necessary articles of faith. (p. 78.) "The sentiments advanced [by the New School] were represented as Socinian, Pelagian, Arminian, pantheistical, atheistical," &c. (p. 87); and "*a memorial on the present state of the Presbyterian Church*," signed by twenty ministers and one hundred elders, was presented to the General Assembly of 1834, remonstrating and testifying against

* *Minutes of the Assembly of* 1837, p. 444.

the "errors declared to be held and taught within the bounds of the Presbyterian Church." (p. 93.) This memorial was referred to a committee, whose report, though opposed to the views of the memorialists, was adopted by a considerable majority of the Assembly. But, although the supreme judicatory of the Church had thus pronounced judgment against the views of the Old School, the minority did not consider themselves bound by its decision. They protested against it, and published an "Act and Testimony," addressed to the ministers, elders, and private members of the Presbyterian Church, in which they declare that they are constrained to appeal to its members, "in relation to the *alarming errors* which have hitherto been connived at, and now at length have been countenanced and sustained by the acts of the supreme judicatory of the Church." In conclusion, it recommends to the churches "to refuse to give countenance to ministers, elders, agents, editors, teachers, or to those who are, in any other capacity, engaged in religious instruction or effort, who hold *the heresies* which it condemns." (p. 96.)

This document, subscribed by a numerous and influential body of ministers and ruling elders, was extensively circulated throughout the Presbyterian Church, and contributed not a little to create such an excitement in relation to the spread of heresy among them, as enabled the Old School to return a majority of the members of the General Assembly which met in 1835. By this means the decisions of the former Assembly, in regard to some of the leading points in controversy, were *reversed*, and the doctrinal errors, alleged to be prevalent in the Church, were pronounced to be of a "dangerous and pestiferous character." (p. 99.) The Old School party, however, did not rest satisfied with this decision, by which the sentiments of the opposite school were virtually branded with the name of HERESY by the highest judicatory of their church. They determined to suppress them altogether, or cut off the errorists from their communion. With this view, they filed articles of impeachment for heresy against the prominent advocates of the New-School divinity, — among others, Dr. Lyman Beecher, formerly of this city, who was tried on "charges of heresy, slander, and hypocrisy" (p. 106), tabled against him by the Rev. Dr. Wilson of Cincinnati. But failing in the end to obtain a verdict against these men, and to cast them out of the church, they, at length, resolved — to repeal the Act of Union of 1801; — to cut off the synods of Utica, Geneva,

Genesee, and the Western Reserve; and to exclude the American Home Missionary Society and the American Education Society from the Presbyterian Church. Having a majority in the General Assembly of 1837, they carried these measures through with a high hand, and thus consummated that violent act which Mr. Crocker designates *The Catastrophe of the Presbyterian Church*. Thus "the Assembly of 1837 used its unrivalled authority in such a manner as to affect the rights, the privileges, and the opinions of a large portion of the inhabitants of this nation. In addition to the dismemberment of its own body, it struck a blow at benevolent institutions; . . . . . and it aimed not only to destroy existing relations in the churches under its care, but to sever the bonds of union, which for many years had existed between itself and other ecclesiastical bodies, as the ground of friendly intercourse and cheerful co-operation in the work of spreading the gospel; no wonder, then, that its proceedings have agitated the mass of the people, and produced an uncommon excitement throughout the length and breadth of the land." (p. 2.)

We regret that our limits will not permit us to follow Mr. Crocker through the historical developments he furnishes of the nature and progress of theological controversy and religious dissensions among the self-styled Evangelical Orthodox in New England, which occupy the larger portion of his work. They may afford us the materials of an article, if, at some future time, we should take occasion to review Dr. Gardiner Spring's *Dissertation on Native Depravity*, which occupies so prominent a place in the New England controversy. Our readers will scarcely be surprised to learn, that the man who had the hardihood to proclaim, in the presence of a public meeting in the City Hall of New York, that he would prefer Voltairian infidelity to Catholic Christianity, "denominates those from whom he differs least as *Pelagians*, and sets up his own individual opinion as the standard of orthodoxy." (p. 221.)

Such was the disorganized state of the Presbyterian Church in 1837, so bitter the *odium theologicum* and controversial warfare which raged within its bosom, that a premium of two hundred dollars was offered for "the best tract or treatise on Dissensions in the Churches." This liberal offer called forth twenty-seven writers on this prolific theme, whose manuscripts were formally submitted to a committee composed of three learned doctors of divinity, by whom the pre-

mium was awarded to Mr. Church, for the work which stands first on our list, and which was subsequently published as the *Prize Essay*. If any Protestant writer be capable of assigning the *cause* and indicating the *cure* of religious dissensions on a Protestant basis, we may presume Mr. Church is the man, and that his Essay offers us the best and most satisfactory solution of the problem to be obtained. If his theory be unsound and impracticable, we may safely conclude that this besetting sin of Protestantism is incurable. That he was well qualified for the task he undertook cannot be doubted. He had previously disciplined his mind for this work of Christian charity by writing a treatise on the "Philosophy of Benevolence"; and he had especially prepared himself for its execution by "long continued thinking and much careful observation." The handsome premium awarded to him, among so many competitors for the prize, by a committee of learned divines, attests his ability and the superior excellence of his treatise. It may be taken, therefore, as unfolding the best plan hitherto devised, by which the children of the Reformation may be brought into union, and made of "of one heart and one mind."

The arduous nature of the task he assumed, and the meagre prospect of realizing the object contemplated, seem to strike the author forcibly on the very threshold. He opens his *Introduction* with this painfully humiliating acknowledgment: —

"The difficulties of the subject before us are felt by the writer to be above what any mortal, unguided by divine light, can surmount. Nor, under any circumstances, can more be expected than the suggestion of trains of thought that *may* lead to other trains of a more lucid character, and so *commence* the process of approximation to that most desirable state when all the family of God on earth shall be of one heart and of one mind. Nothing, in our view, short of a miracle upon human nature, can promise such a result; but the clear exhibition of those *causes* of dissension which all parties and sects have only to see to reprobate, together with those *principles*, the practical adoption of which, without interfering with any one of their present honest convictions, would in the end produce all the harmony that can be expected among imperfect beings. Bare exhortation to union, though eloquent and forcible as an angel could use, till some method is pointed out which will lead to it without contravening what different portions of the church feel to be sacred and inviolable, will be powerless and vain. To array ourselves also against the spirit and measures of any specific portion, as the sole or principal cause

of dissensions, when it may, *perhaps*, embody as much that is pleasing to God as any other, would foreclose with them the success of our endeavour, would exasperate unkind feelings, and, though it might please, could produce no better results upon those who should be spared the lash of our rod. Besides, all such partial representations are not true in fact, as every accurate and candid observer upon the course of human events must be convinced. The upas-tree of dissension strikes its roots alike into every division of the Christian world, drawing from each, in degrees more nearly equal than may be imagined, its means of nourishment and growth."

As the Essayist does not probably recognize the Catholic Church even as one of the "divisions of the Christian world," and assuming his statement to apply exclusively to the *Evangelicals*, for whose special benefit the Essay was designed, we will not gainsay the truth of what he here asserts. Otherwise, we should consider it our duty to protest against his sweeping denunciation of the Christian world, and to show that the great body of professing Christians, included within the pale of the Catholic Church, are now, and have been for ages, of "one mind and of one heart," on all points of doctrine, and have none of those differences and dissensions among them that exist among the miserable sects cut off from her communion, and who are commonly known by the name of the heresiarch from whom they derive their system of doctrine or church polity. It is to these sects Mr. Church addresses his arguments and expostulations throughout his Essay; — of them he speaks at the close of the first section of his introductory remarks, where he informs us that the object he has in view is "to pave the way, *if possible*, for an adjustment of those differences among *Christians* [sectarians] which are so revolting to Heaven, so prolific of scandal to the worthy name by which they are called, so much a matter of triumph among the enemies of the cross, and so painful to every correct sensibility." (p. 19.) He does not presume to indulge the hope of a speedy termination of those scandalous differences among his Christian, or rather sectarian, brethren. He even leaves it doubtful whether it be possible to pave the way to the adjustment, at some future period, "of all their most considerable differences." He has not a word of comfort for the "family of God," who now reap the whirlwind of dissension, as the natural product of the wind of false doctrine, sowed by their forefathers in their lust of innovation. The Evangelical Chris-

tians of the present generation, he affirms, "must probably leave their carcasses in the wilderness, before one born under better influences, and devoted to holier and enlightened training, can enter upon the land of Christian peace and plenty. But though doomed to war ourselves," he adds, "is it any reason why we should not seek a more peaceful inheritance for our children?" (p. 40.) Certainly not. Seek, gentlemen, a more peaceful inheritance than Luther and Calvin have bequeathed to you in their misnamed Reformation; but the experience of three centuries ought to teach you that it cannot be found out of the communion of our one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

Mr. Church's plan of Christian union, by which he hopes it may be possible to obviate religious dissensions among Protestants, differs essentially from the scheme devised by other writers on the same subject, who were as anxious as himself to organize an *Evangelical Alliance*, which should present the appearance, at least, of unity and union among the various Reformed sects. Seeing that the zeal with which the several denominations contended for their respective sectarian peculiarities was the chief cause of dissension and the great obstacle to union, these religious peacemakers recommended that those sects which agreed in fundamental and essential articles should "agree to differ" on all other points of doctrine. This scheme of union our Essayist rejects, as tending to latitudinarianism; for, he observes, "by making it appear that each party is bound to concede that all others are right, on condition of their returning the compliment, would be a fearful stride towards the profane indifference of skeptical philosophy. Moreover," he adds, "it would be a violation of the oft-repeated apostolic injunctions to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints." (p. 41.)

A more serious objection to the hitherto prevailing theory on this important subject, our author contends, is, that, even admitting its practicability, it would tend rather to aggravate than to remedy the evil. As to the distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines, he does not hesitate to pronounce it prejudicial to the cause of Christian union, and calculated to produce the most unhappy results. Our readers may, perhaps, — after what we ourselves advanced in our Review for January last, — be curious to learn by what process of reasoning a *Protestant* writer explodes this favorite theory of Protestant *unity*, and thus divests his system of all pretension

to that acknowledged mark of the true Church; we give his argument in his own words.

"We conceive that the union of Christians can never result from conventional arrangement. Even should the denominations be induced thus to unite in the same ecclesiastical organization, and yet the present principles of religious inquiry were left unbroken and undestroyed, it would, like healing a wound with the core still in the flesh, only provide to have the whole break out in new and more malignant forms than ever. Nor would the secession of a portion of each denomination to form a *union party* be attended with any better results. So long as the germs of the evil remain in our habits of thought and feeling, such a measure would have no other effect than to add another to the list of competitors for the popular favor. We have parties enough already; and the addition of new ones, like bringing a *corps de reserve* to the battle's point, never fails of incensing the deadly affray.

"Owing also to our inability to fix the line between essential and non-essential, substantial and un-substantial Christianity, or to the want of those clear and satisfactory views of the subject which others seem to have obtained, we have omitted this distinction as of little account in our plan for uniting Christians. We apprehend that the work of distinguishing between that portion of the Christian scheme which is essential, and that which is not so, would produce very dissimilar views, and thus would incense, rather than extinguish, the spirit of dissension. Certain positions would, in the view of some, fall on one side of this line, and in the view of others they would fall on the other side of it, and endless war would arise about what is essential and non-essential.

"Not only so, but this distinction itself will be found to involve results which no Christian, it seems to us, can fully contemplate without alarm. Essential! to what? To the salvation of a soul? Is it the object to retain among the things which are essential only those parts of revealed truth which must have access to a sinner's mind, in order to his regeneration? But who is able to determine how small an amount may contribute to this result? If we retain only so much as was in the mind of that person to whose conversion the lowest possible degree of divine knowledge contributed, our essential or substantial Christianity would, we imagine, be compressed into exceedingly narrow limits. How few and simple must have been the inspired truths which effected the conversion of the thief upon the cross, and the thousands of others, who, in the first age of Christianity, believed and were baptized, upon hearing their first sermon from apostolic lips! But even admitting such to be our definition of essential truth, how indeterminate must be our conceptions, since it lies not within the prov-

ince of any man to fix the lines of religious knowledge, below which a saving effect cannot be produced!

"And equal uncertainty will attend our thinking, if we make it consist in those points which are common to the Evangelical sects. To ascertain the points which they have in common at this moment would be a most difficult task; and even if it were done, we should be left, at any future period, in great doubt concerning the changes which the fluctuations of opinion in those sects may have produced. Our standard of orthodoxy, being the points of doctrine and practice which are common to these sects, would be subject to all the mutations which are so characteristic of poor, erring, human nature. Such a definition of substantial Christianity would suspend the revelation of Heaven, and the last hope of man, upon the brittle thread of our own dark and misguided reason.

"If we mean, however, by substantial or essential Christianity, not only that portion of inspired truth which is necessary to the conversion of a sinner, but also to perfect the work of his sanctification, then we see not how we could exclude any part of that to which God has affixed the seal of inspiration. Is it not all essential to the perfecting of the saints, to the edifying of the body of Christ? Dare we omit any thing which God has not omitted? If our idea of essential or substantial, therefore, as applied to God's truth, comes any thing short of the whole revealed subject-matter, it will have an effect to increase rather than diminish the obstacles to union among Christians, and, at the same time, will impose the hazardous task of determining what portion of that to which God has affixed his own infallible impress we must retain, and what portion we may sacrifice. We confess our fear of going an inch in this direction.

"But we imagine that the distinction of essential and non-essential has been introduced into this subject, either with reference to the opinions of men, or to the different degrees of importance which attach to the different portions of inspired truth. Now, if it be applied in the former sense, then we say that all merely human opinions, or all over and above the meaning conveyed by 'the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth,' as legitimately interpreted, are alike non-essential, while *the whole* of that meaning is essential. This is an easy distinction, so long as we make no reservations for merely human opinions, and no exclusions of the inspired subject-matter. Or if we apply this distinction to the different degrees of importance in the truths dictated by the Spirit, then we have only to say that the terms which we employ to express our meaning are not well chosen. Because one inspired truth is less important than another, is it therefore unessential?

"But we confess that it is easier to show what will not unite the spiritual family, than to obviate the barriers to this most desirable object. Nor do we conceive it possible, as before hinted, for the ingenuity of man to devise any other than prospective measures for their removal. It must be done by turning Christian feeling, investigation, and effort into channels that shall produce an ultimate confluence." — pp. 43 – 46.

The line of argument traced out in this extract differs but little from that usually adopted by many of our controversial divines, when combating the latitudinarian principle it refutes. But now that the erroneous character and skeptical tendency of that principle have been exposed, in a Protestant prize essay treating *ex professo* of the subject to which it relates, we presume Protestants, at least of any note, will not venture, henceforth, to adduce it in proof of their absurd pretensions to unity in fundamental and essential doctrines, to which they have heretofore laid claim, notwithstanding the many important points of doctrine on which they differed. Like the vain and almost impious chimera of an *invisible church*, which they invented as a plausible subterfuge when pressed to show where their church existed before Luther's time, but which they have long since discarded as an untenable position ; so we trust they will also surrender this imaginary stronghold of Protestantism, when they discover, as they must ere long, that the ingenious device by which they attempted to preserve the appearance of unity, where there was none in reality, has proved one of the most fruitful causes of dissension, and created a formidable obstacle to the establishment of Christian union itself.

The removal of the barriers that prevent the spiritual family of the Reformation from uniting together, and forming one body and one fold, can be effected, according to Mr. Church, only "by turning Christian feeling, investigation, and effort into channels that shall produce an ultimate confluence." Now, the question is, what are these channels ? As a consistent Protestant, the author is obliged to contend that the Bible is the *sole* medium through which the "*primitive Christian conception*," as he calls it, of "the truth as it is in Jesus" can be reached. But all Protestant sects have for centuries made use of this channel to arrive at the knowledge of the divine truths of revelation ; yet they do not agree in their views of the primitive Christian conception. Mr. Church not only admits this humiliating fact, but even contends that they

have perverted the inspired sense in consequence of "modelling that sense by mental philosophy, natural religion, or human science, and determining what *is* from our ideas of what *ought* to be." The estimate he forms of the boasted orthodoxy of all these sects, and the picture he draws of the social evils resulting from their divisions, are worthy of note as coming from a Protestant minister.

"*There is not, in our view, a form of Christianity in the universe that answers to the primitive model.* We do not allude to the imperfections common to human nature of those who hold them, but to the *principles* and practices which are component parts of these systems themselves, and which a man must adopt, if he makes them his guide in matters of faith and duty. That *some* of them do not accord to the primitive conception all admit; but every one would make an exception in favor of his own denomination. He believes that *his* denomination, or at least the basis of its organization, is a perfect fac-simile of the primitive model, — that all others must come and bow down to it, as the family of Jacob did to young Joseph in Egypt, before the latter-day glory can dawn; and hence, he is fired with the zeal of an apostle to proselyte all other portions of the Christian world to his own measure of thinking. Thence arise endless wars; the laboratory of Christian thinking is made the armory of pointless and ineffectual polemics; the press groans under a burden of controversial lore; those woes of afflicted, ignorant, degraded humanity, which the Church is required to relieve, are left unmitigated; the enemies of the heavenly kingdom make the welkin ring with joyful acclaim at the civil commotions with which it is rent; and the ferment which is kept up in the social state is most dismal and disastrous. And all for what? Why, simply, to secure the perpetuity and preëminence of certain combinations of religious thought and practice, all of which, we pledge ourselves to make appear, are as remote from the primitive Christian conception as they are from each other. Dark and portentous would be the glare of the millennial church, if its model should correspond to the best of them!" — p. 48.

It is here frankly confessed that all the various sects of Protestants are as far removed from the primitive Christian model as they are from each other, though they all profess to take the Bible as their only rule and guide in matters of faith and practice. To bring them back to the ONE FAITH, and "to secure uniformity in their views of the revealed system of faith and duty, two things are necessary," observes Mr. Church: "the first is to give the study of the Scriptures its

due position in the world of mind and in our plans of education; and the other is to conduct this study on those principles of induction which guide our inquiries in other departments of knowledge." (p. 54.) So it appears the Reformers and their spiritual progeny have been reading and studying their Bible for the last three hundred years without obtaining correct views of faith and duty! Though learned commentators have spent their lives in the study of the sacred volume, and filled whole libraries with their notes and expositions, they have not succeeded in discovering the inspired sense of the oracles of God. They hardly contain a paragraph upon which *different* constructions have not been placed. Indeed, says our Essayist, "could the plain matter-of-fact men, who wrote the New Testament, read the commentaries on the text they furnished, which have been written in view of the modern systems of divinity, they must lose the consciousness of their own identity, before they could be made to believe that the construction put upon their words is the meaning they intended to convey." (p. 86.)

Mr. Church not only confesses that Protestants have thus far utterly failed to seize the true doctrine of our Lord, but he contends that they are not even in a condition to do it, and that the attempt to draw up a statement of it would only tend to increase and perpetuate dissension.

"We assume, that, as nothing has been accomplished for the peace of the Church by schedules of Christian doctrine and practice, so nothing is to be hoped from them in future. We therefore make no attempt to draught one of a more lucid character, which shall be adapted to awaken in all the same convictions. So far otherwise is the fact, that these pages assume that the influences under which our habits of religious thinking have been formed, like magnetic steel in a watch, disturb all the movements of our minds, and so give us a result somewhat different from the truth. And hence, should we attempt to separate the pure gold from the alloy in our forms of Christianity, so as to make a new form, to embody all the excellences of the old, and none of their defects, we should, in our present state, mistake the one for the other, and our extract would have as much foreign admixture, perhaps, as any one now before the public. Can any man, who is competent to judge in the matter, pretend that the forms of a more recent date have advantages in this respect over those which have been longer in the field? Those who think it so easy a matter to disencumber themselves of the ten thousand influences which have sprung up, since the angel of inspiration took his final flight from

our sphere, to corrupt the sources of our religious thinking, know little of the human tissue, or of the difficulty of extracting from it what has been so thoroughly wrought into its texture. The subject-matter of the Bible has not yet succeeded to its due position in the intellectual world, — *we are not holy enough*, — our thinking is not sufficiently immersed in 'Siloa's brook,'— and our passions and prejudices are too much enlisted in the existing parties, — to admit of our taking in at once the whole primitive Christian conception, unchanged and unmutilated." — pp. 52, 53.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the Essay is that in which the author sets forth the influences which disturb the Protestant in his study of the Bible, and induce him to misinterpret it. The Scriptures must be understood, and in the sense intended by the Holy Ghost, or they are not the word of God.

" It should always be considered, that the truth revealed is distinct from the language through which it is conveyed, and must remain as inaccessible as if not revealed at all, unless we have the means of extracting it from the crude elements of words, phrases, and idioms in which it lies imbedded. The existence of an order of public instructers, in connection with the inspired economy, appears to have found its basis in this fact. It began immediately upon the return of the remnant from Babylon, when the Jews first lost the pure Hebrew through intercourse with foreign nations, and when they were cut off from all connection with the thought of their sacred writings, except as they were made acquainted with it by competent interpreters. It appears to have been from this germ, that a permanent order of uninspired teachers in the Christian Church sprang. Its establishment seems to have arisen from the necessity of some further aid in bringing inspired thought into contact with the mass of mind, than the simple record of it in one or two languages. By thus regarding the necessity and the intention of this institution, therefore, the people may learn what kind of teachers to select. and what to expect from them; and the incumbents of the office are admonished to confine themselves, more exclusively, to documentary Christianity. Their business is not to originate or concoct new matter, but simply to explain so clearly, that God's own thoughts shall blaze before the public eye, and burn upon the public conscience.

" Our illumination from the word of God is exactly in proportion to the degree in which we enter into the spirit and meaning of the language employed. The cant, whining, and sanctimonious manner in which the sacred pages are often glanced over by those who are more concerned to appear religious than to be instructed, or who desire to be so, but mistake the mode, while it

imposes on the weak and credulous without improving them, leads the more discerning, but equally thoughtless, to treat the Bible with neglect, as having no meaning at all, or none worth the labor of digging from the rubbish under which it lies buried." — pp. 176, 177.

But the Protestant, in endeavouring to ascertain the sense of the sacred text, is subject to numerous and powerful disturbing influences. The Gospel itself, though it often does produce, is not exactly adapted to produce, uniformity of opinion. (p. 71.) It was not intended to do so, and could not.

" Nor could the Gospel attain the end of producing a perfect uniformity of judgment, either upon religion or any other subject, without induing us with the power of arriving at unerring conclusions. Before this is done, we must all seize, in every case, upon the same facts, place them in the same order, give each of them the same bearing in our process of reasoning, and that must be the exact bearing of truth, or the result will not be the same. In one word, our minds must be made on the same scale of strength and clearness, expansiveness and vigor, and this must be the scale of infallibility like God, or the end cannot be attained of producing between us a perfect uniformity of judgment." — pp. 74, 75.

The great difficulty lies in the insufficiency of language as the medium of revelation.

" Though the Gospel aims at effecting a lodgment of the same thoughts in every mind, or the same subject-matter, yet, from the character of the human understanding, and the medium of their transmission, we should presume that the saving influence might exist with *very considerable error*, confusion, and darkness in judging of the precise nature of what is revealed. If language is sufficiently accurate for all practical purposes, it is by no means an infallible vehicle for the transmission of knowledge. It probably renders us more liable to false impressions than any one of our organs of sensation. This is true of a living language, as it falls from the lips of a living speaker, but applies much more forcibly to one that long since ceased to be spoken. . . . . .

" But a dead language labors under still greater disadvantages in regard to being understood, since the meaning of its words can only be determined from the fragments of it which have survived the ravages of time. And how difficult is it to recall the ten thousand circumstances, physical, moral, political, or religious, from which the writer's conceptions took their mould! How much of the force and beauty even of the elegant pages of the unknown Junius, who wrote in our own language less than a cen-

tury since, are now lost, on account of the oblivion which has come over many of those features in the posture of the political world, or those characters and events, upon which he animadverts! It is difficult to place ourselves in his condition, so as to feel the influences which operated to give shade to the meaning of his language. And it must be still more difficult to place ourselves in the circumstances of a man who lived thousands of years since, in a different country from our own, and in a state of society now so completely extinct as to leave scarce a wreck behind. And yet we must be able to do it, or we cannot be expected, in every minute particular, to do justice to his meaning. The ever-varying circumstances, therefore, which give rise to different combinations of thought in the mind, together with other causes, must have buried, beyond the hope of resurrection, no small share of every literary relic of antiquity."—pp. 84, 85.

But besides this alleged natural and inevitable obstacle to a just understanding of the Scriptures, the Protestant approaches them not with a simple mind, solely for the purpose of ascertaining their sense. He has certain preconceived notions, certain intellectual systems of his own, by which he would interpret them, and to which their sense must be made to conform.

"The human understanding does not admit of such perfect uniformity in interpreting any document, ancient or modern. There will be errors in different minds, arising from mistaking the proper force of words, from omitting some material item in their conception of the subject as a whole, from an inaccurate arrangement of the ideas expressed, from giving some too much and others too little prominence, or from other sources. Previous habits of thinking, also, will impart their own hues to every new subject that may arise. Let all the facts of the New Testament be spread out before two men of ordinary capacity, the one a pagan and the other a Mahometan, for instance, and the ideas which they would derive from them would be distinctly marked by the notions previously derived from their respective religions."—p. 88.

"*Absurd notions* of interpretation do much to close the avenues of the mind against inspired thought. These notions are variously modified by the systems which different classes of Christians have, from first to last, adopted. But in the general characteristic of assuming that the sense of Scripture is to be rested, not wholly upon the language employed, but upon the analogy of faith, or something independent of the laws of philology, they are all alike. Few, indeed, have run these notions up to the same extreme with the neologists of Germany, who aver that reason alone can decide in matters of faith, that the authority of Scripture is to be allowed only when it coincides with our convictions,

and that it is nothing more than a human book, 'in which noble and wise men of former times have laid up, entirely in the ordinary manner, the results of their own reflection.'* But just so far as we allow the system of faith which we have adopted, or any thing else, to influence us in attaching to the words of Scripture a meaning which they cannot bear, when legitimately interpreted, just so far we verge towards this dismal extreme. For, the moment we vary the meaning, in the slightest degree, from what God intended to communicate, we act on a principle which, pursued up, would lead to the wildest extremes.

"That no denomination in this country are willing to avow such principles of interpretation, we admit; but that every denomination is more or less influenced by them is the only fact that will account for the diversified systems which they contrive to extort from the inspired pages. Can it be supposed that God speaks to us in language so indeterminate as to admit of all these constructions? Would it not be an imputation upon his wisdom and veracity to indulge such a thought? That there should be diversities of opinion, to some extent, in regard to the meaning of the Bible, is to be expected from the constitution of the human mind and other causes, as we have before shown; but it is hardly to be supposed, that the conflicting systems of faith and practice, which have so long competed for the public favor, could have been deduced from the inspired text, unaided by false principles of interpretation. How happens it that the millions of minds, who have first and last advocated these respective systems, should hit precisely upon that track of thought, in reading the sacred pages, unless some common influence operated upon them to produce this result?

"Though all men, even with correct principles of interpretation, might not deduce the same meaning from 'the language which the Holy Ghost teacheth,' yet it is hardly to be supposed, that one or two millions of each generation should hit upon the same system of faith and practice; another million or two should hit upon the same system, though different from the first; and so, that the social state should be split up into masses, according to definite lines of religious demarcation; unless the same cause acted upon all the individuals, in each of these respective divisions, to produce in them the same habits of thought, feeling, and action. A uniformity of effect determines the cause to be uniform. Hence, the individuals pursuing each of these different lines of religious thinking and conduct must act under a common influence.

"This question being settled, therefore, we are prepared for another, — Whether this influence, in the case of each of these

---

* Kant, as found in *Biblical Repository*, Vol. I., p. 122.

great divisions, is found in the Bible itself *as legitimately interpreted*, or in sources wholly extraneous to its pages? And the very proposal of such a question, we imagine, will show every one that it comes from sources extraneous to the Bible. That is, these different bodies of Christians are each under influences, in judging of the meaning of the Divine Word, for which that word is not accountable, and by which their differences among themselves are produced. If they have all drawn more or less from the Bible, they have drawn enough from other sources to conduct them to widely different theoretical and practical results. And the individuals of each of these bodies are willing to admit this fact of those in the others, but not in its application to themselves. We think, however, that it would be easy to show that each and all of them, so far as they are swayed by those systems to which they have attached themselves, entertain unphilological and erroneous views of the faith once delivered to the saints. The reason is, that they have all been concocted under influences, in judging of the word of God, which must necessarily lead to a distortion of its specific statements, as well as foreclose an impartial view of its teaching as a whole. Hence, all the systems, which give to Christianity its diversified forms in every generation, embody, with considerable truth, so much foreign matter as to prevent the different classes attached to them from meeting on the simple ground of revealed thoughts. Brethren in Christ, this may seem sweeping, and perhaps we err; but we entreat you to work out the problem of our divisions candidly and impartially, and if the data of reasoning with which we are furnished from facts and truth do not give you this result, we must confess ourselves greatly disappointed.

"Each of the systems, whether that of Calvinism, Arminianism, Pelagianism, or any other, rely for their support, not upon the Bible as a whole, but upon a certain class of passages and facts, of which they take such a view as makes it necessary for them to explain away, soften down, or variously modify another class of passages and facts that seem to look another way."—pp. 177–180.

But we are exceeding our limits, and have room for only one or two more extracts. The Protestant cannot consistently take the Bible as the word of God on the authority of the Church. He is therefore obliged to rely chiefly for the evidence of its inspiration on its intrinsic character. But in the course of his inquiry he meets with passages which seem contradictory, and to which infidel writers appeal in their attempts to assail the authority of the Bible. These he considers it his duty to attempt to reconcile; but the attempt, Mr. Church tells us, is often fatal.

"O, could we read the fate of former adventurers in this region, we should doubtless find among them thousands, of the most flattering early promise, who have terminated their career in vice and atheism. After searching long for the grounds of harmony and coincidence between different revealed truths, they have at length discovered the impossibility of succeeding; but, alas, mistaking still the proper province of human knowledge, they have confounded that impossibility with the certainty that the Bible is false, and so have snapped the cords by which it bound them to virtue, and, like lions escaped from their cage, have gone to and fro seeking whom they might devour.

"Others still, being less competent to judge of the difference between what they know and what cannot be known, have fallen into the supposition that they had discovered the secret connection and harmony of these irreconcilable truths, and thus have given battle to those whose superior discernment qualified them for controverting their positions, and, under a pretence that Christianity itself was equally concerned with themselves in the contest, have rallied all their forces only to make their defeat still more decisive and disgraceful.

"And in addition to the former classes, there is another to whom Christianity is too dear to be sacrificed on account of their inability to reconcile its seemingly adverse statements; and hence, the ill effects of attempting it are confined chiefly to the time wasted upon that attempt, the distraction of mind which it occasions, and to its influence in diverting them from more important researches and more useful labors. But the worst consequence of supposing it necessary to ascertain the grounds of harmony between the facts of religion is its influence in incensing and perpetuating the spirit of controversy." — pp. 101, 102.

Is it possible to read these extracts, and believe that the author has any confidence in the Bible alone as an available rule of faith? If we are to believe him, the very attempt to reconcile the apparent contradictions of the Scriptures and to harmonize their doctrines is time thrown away; is to incense and perpetuate the spirit of controversy, — that is, dissent; to prepare one's self for a more decisive and disgraceful defeat, or for the plunge into vice and atheism! What more could he concede to the enemies of the Bible? What more ample concession could he, as a Protestant, make to the unbelievers in our holy religion itself?

The "disturbing influences" he points out are inherent in the nature of the case, and inevitable. No man can possibly escape them in his efforts to interpret the Bible. The mind must be formed, before it can approach the sacred text as

a competent interpreter ; and if it is, it will have its habits, its doctrines, its preconceived notions, through the medium of which, by a law of its own nature, it must contemplate whatever it reads. Only the new-born babe is free from prepossession and the disturbing influences enumerated ; but, unhappily, the new-born babe wants the positive qualifications indispensable to a Biblical interpreter. What, then, is the remedy for sectarian dissensions ? If we understand Mr. Church, his remedy resolves itself into abstinence from all attempts to form from the Scriptures a body of Christian doctrine, to take the Scriptures as they are, philologically explained, and to prepare, by doing good in an uncontroversial way, for understanding their simple sense, and being contented with it.

The great cause of dissension, he says, is in the efforts to obtain a body of coherent and self-consistent doctrines from the Bible. The controversy does not turn on the simple facts or statements of Scripture, but on the conclusions which men draw, or the doctrines they attempt to deduce from them. But conclusions or deductions of reason from revealed *data* are not revealed truths, and should not be imposed or regarded as matters of faith. Therefore, they should not be drawn, or, if drawn, should not be insisted on as matters of faith. But however valid this reasoning might be in the mouth of a Catholic, who has already a body of faith drawn up and imposed by divine authority, it cannot be adopted by a Protestant ; for the simple reason, that he has no way to determine the revealed truth, but by conclusions or deductions from the written word. If he is denied the right to regard these conclusions and deductions as articles of faith, he has and can have no articles of faith at all. His belief becomes a mere vague belief in certain detached and incoherent statements or isolated and barren facts. This is evident from what the author himself says : —

" And one has only to look over the history of controversies among the people of God [sectarians], to convince himself that a large proportion of them have arisen from enforcing uniformity upon subjects which cannot be so perfectly settled by the Scriptures as to produce, in all cases, an identity of conviction. They have oftener had respect to deductions from the facts of the Bible than to the facts themselves. The point at issue has not been, whether this or that fact is stated in the Bible, but whether this or that principle is a legitimate deduction from those facts and statements which are alike clear to all. Take, for example, the con-

troversies which have existed in reference to the person of Christ, (and who can estimate the extent of talent and labor which, from the time of Arius to this day, have been exhausted upon it?) and it will be found that they have not so much regarded what the Bible speaks, as the use to be made of its testimony. Let a Socinian and Trinitarian of common capacity sit down to the task of reading together the statements of the New Testament concerning Christ, taking them one by one, and their understanding of them, unless previously determined by their systems, would be very nearly the same. That Jesus was baptized of John in the Jordan, — that the Spirit in the form of a dove descended and abode upon him, while a voice from heaven proclaimed him the Son of God, — that he was tempted forty days and nights in the wilderness, — that he raised Lazarus from the dead, — and that the words and works ascribed to him by his four biographers were spoken and wrought as represented, they would both agree. But let them undertake to make out from these facts what sort of a being Christ was, *whether God, or man, or both, or neither, and they would be instantly thrown into the heat of controversy.*" — pp. 59, 60.

Now, what sort of faith in Christ is that which leaves it undecided whether he was God, or man, or both, or neither? Does Mr. Church suppose that men will consent to be mocked by having that called a revelation which reveals nothing? Can the human mind be contented to say two and two, two and two, without adding, *are four*? He knows little of the human mind if he does. The abstinence he contends for is impracticable, and would be fatal, on the Protestant principle, to all theological belief, if it were not, and if it were observed.

Nor has the author more to hope from philology. Suppose he succeeds in raising the Scriptures to their "due position in our plans of education," and has them interpreted by grammar and lexicon only, has he secured the interpreter against the disturbing influences he so well describes? Who will guaranty him that the grammarian and lexicographer have had no prepossessions, no preconceived notions, no favorite doctrines, they wished to advance? The character of the first edition of Johnson's dictionary of the English language is not unknown, and the Hebrew of Gesenius is almost another language from that of the Buxtorfs. Nor is this all. What will guaranty him the purity and integrity of the sacred text? The text can be settled only by criticism; and is he sure that the critic is free from all bias, and that his preconceived notions have had no influence in leading him to adopt one various reading and to reject another? Philology is, no doubt, well

in its place; but what it may do, when too exclusively relied on, we are taught by German exegetics, which end in frittering away the word into — nothing.

Mr. Church would have the Bible explained philologically, and its statements regarded as ultimate facts, which may serve as the basis of an inductive theological science, and this, too, as one of the conditions of union, after he had shown that drawing conclusions from its simple statements is the great cause of disunion! Does the learned author know what induction means? What is it, in fact, but the very thing he condemns? But he is charmed with the boasted magic of induction in the natural sciences. He is a Protestant, and is bound to be so. But will he tell us what induction has done in the field of natural science? Observation and experiment have done something there, we concede; but that induction has done any thing we shall be prepared to believe, when we find a natural *science*, so called, that is any thing more than a mere hypothesis, or even when we find all naturalists consenting to adopt one and the same hypothesis.

The last resort is equally hopeless. Men by doing good may, undoubtedly, be prepared to relish the truth; and our Lord himself teaches us, that, if any man will do the will of his Father in heaven, he shall know of the doctrine. But our Lord said this on the supposition that there was a teacher present to tell what the will of the Father is. Mr. Church adopts the doctrine, that do good and you will be prepared to know the truth. He must have holiness of life, and active benevolence, before he can be *prepared* to know the truth. But how, before he knows the truth, can he know what is good? or how, without the truth, have true holiness of life? If he can be holy without a knowledge of the truth, what matters it whether he know the truth or not? Let him follow out the doctrine he lays down under this head, and he will find himself in that very latitudinarianism he condemns.

Mr. Church is, however, a man of ability, and these absurdities and contradictions belong less to him than to his system. His work is a complete and unanswerable demonstration of the impossibility of harmony and union on the Protestant principle. Harmony and union are, in the nature of things, possible only in the truth, and in some uniform and infallible means of ascertaining it. His work frankly confesses that Protestants have not the truth, and it sets out on the assumption that it is yet to be found, and that they

must be subjected to a long course of judicious discipline, before they can be *prepared* to find it, or to recognize it when they find it. Uniform and infallible means of ascertaining it they have not, and the author proves they cannot have. Hence, he supposes it impossible to avoid mingling "very considerable errors" with the word. Why, then, talk of harmony and union? Why seek for them on the Protestant principle? Why not boldly accept the scandalous dissensions and divisions of Protestants, unblushingly assert that they are grateful to God and profitable to men; or else frankly acknowledge that Protestantism is not only a crime, but a blunder,—that it has failed, and ever must fail, of its purpose? Do be consistent. If you will adhere to the Protestant principle, do so manfully; take it with all its necessary consequences, and do not try to deceive yourselves. Three hundred years you have tried your experiment; you have thoroughly tested your principle, and you know as well as ever you can know its practical workings. You can get no different results, unless you change one or both of your factors. There is no error in the process. Why, then, be ashamed of the results? If your principles are good, your results are good, and should not be disowned. If it is good to sow the wind, it is good to reap the whirlwind. If it is good to sow to the flesh, it is good of the flesh to reap corruption. If it is good to serve the Devil, it is good to be damned. Do not be ashamed of your wages. Do not add to the sin of rebellion the disgrace of cowardice. Avow your master, and acknowledge yourselves contented with his pay. If you recoil from the scandalous results of Protestantism, blame not the results, but your system, and abandon it. If ye will not be Christians, at least, for the honor of our common humanity, be MEN.

Nothing seems to us more ridiculous than these efforts of our Protestant friends to effect harmony and union. Nay, we can hardly view them without a species of contempt. Yet we check ourselves. We, after all, see in them a ground of hope. They prove that Protestants are not wholly given over. They prove that they are not satisfied with their present state, and that they feel they have not as yet realized even their own meagre conception of Christianity. The late *World's Convention* in London was a striking proof of this. All Protestantdom is said to have been represented there, and, if so, the whole Protestant world there solemnly confessed to all man-

kind, that hitherto Protestantism has proved a failure, — a total failure. What else assembled that convention? What other fact did it symbolize? And is it nothing that universal Protestantdom should make this confession? The fact is, Protestants are heartily ashamed of the workings of their system; and they feel, that, unless they can do something to secure a result different from what they have hitherto obtained, it is all over with them. They feel that they are not the Church of God; that not for such results as they have obtained did Almighty God establish his kingdom on the earth; and they would fain confer together, and, if possible, devise ways and means to become what they are sensible they are not. But, as says a homely old proverb, "It is impossible to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." Poor men! while we rejoice that the consciousness of a need of religion assembled them together, we cannot but compassionate them in their hopeless task. They are condemned to roll the huge stone up the steep hill, and ever to have it come down with thundering rebound. Unhappy Titans! why would they make war on heaven? Wretched prodigal sons! why must they starve in a strange land, when in their Father's house there is bread enough and to spare? They will, some of them, conscious as they are growing of their famishing condition, yet ask this question, and arise and return, and be welcomed as the lost that is found, as the dead that is alive.

---

Art. III. — *The Constitution of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, containing the Confession of Faith, the Catechisms, and the Directory for the Worship of God; together with the Plan of Government and Discipline, as ratified by the General Assembly at their Sessions in May*, 1821, *and amended in* 1833. Philadelphia: Haswell & Co. 1838.

In the articles inserted in the former series of this Journal on Presbyterianism, we attacked that system in its very foundation, and proved that it has no support but the imagination and sophistry of its authors. This, in reality, is all that is necessary for its complete and entire refutation; for when the foundation is taken away, the superstructure must fall of

itself. Nevertheless, in order the better to expose the folly and absurdity of sectarians, we will go farther, and take up and refute the several Presbyterian doctrines in detail. This, though not absolutely necessary, may not be altogether useless.

In our present article, we shall select for examination the Presbyterian dogma of predestination and fatalism. The errors heretofore refuted, with insignificant exceptions, are common to all classes of Protestants ; but this error is very nearly peculiar to Presbyterians, and that by which they are chiefly distinguished from other sects.

If there be any theology current in the lower regions, it must be the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation ; and among religious societies on earth, they who adhere to it may well be compared to the *Dragons de Mort*, in the late Continental wars, — so called because they offered and received no quarter, but unfurled the black flag, the sure signal of death. The excessive harshness of this theology has revolted most religious minds, and even Presbyterians themselves are not unanimous in its maintenance. In fact, only a portion of their community still retain it ; for, not to mention the celebrated quarrel between Gomar and Arminius, which so impaired the strength of Calvinism, the great schism, in 1837 and 1838, — of which we have spoken in the foregoing article, — and which divided the Presbyterians into two very nearly equal camps, originated chiefly in a difference of opinion in regard to the doctrine of election and reprobation. The New School Presbyterians repudiate, in the main, the cruel and impious teaching on this article of Calvin, and other rigid predestinarians ; while the Old School still retain it, rally under the black flag, their hereditary colors, and swear to prove true *dragoons of death* to the last. If, therefore, the doctrine is abandoned by a part, there is still another part that upholds it, and renders its discussion not altogether superfluous.

In the present article, we shall depart, to some extent, from the method we have heretofore pursued, and, instead of taking up chapter and number as we find them in the *Confession* itself, we shall bring together the several propositions which relate to the same subject, that we may preserve unity and connection in our discussion, and dispose of the whole subject at once. We will give, — 1. A clear and faithful statement of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and show, that, however disguised or mitigated, it is really contained in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith ; 2. We will examine and refute the

proofs which Presbyterians adduce in its support; and, 3. Set forth and establish the Catholic doctrine which is opposed to it.

1. The Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, simply stated, is: God from all eternity determined to create some men for the purpose of making them happy and glorious, and others for the purpose of making them unhappy, and consigning them over to eternal torments. The former he created that he might manifest his goodness; the latter, that he might glorify his justice. If one object, that it does not appear how such a determination can glorify God, and that to create men for the purpose of torturing them savors of cruelty and injustice, it is replied, that the objection is impertinent. Is not a man free to take of the same tree a portion for his fire, and another portion to be made into an ornament for his house?

2. This theology asserts that God from all eternity decreed to bestow certain favors and graces on those elected to manifest his goodness, and to cause the others to commit sin and run into every excess, that he might glorify his justice in their punishment. That is, God does not merely permit the sins of the wicked, as Catholics allege, but positively decrees, ordains them, urges their commission, and actually produces them. In other words, God, in order to secure the execution of his decree concerning the election of some and the reprobation of the rest of mankind, imposes on the former the necessity of being good, and on the latter the necessity of being wicked; or, to use a comparison which is no exaggeration of the doctrine, God makes, on the stormy ocean of this world, some sink, and others float, by giving to the former a leaden jacket which weighs them down, and to the latter a buoyant jacket, a sort of *life-preserver*, around their waists, which keeps them up. Or, rather, to represent still better the present state of men since original sin, God has concealed under the life-preserver a bag of salt, so that, at first, all sink alike; but after a while the salt melts away, the life-preserver prevails, and they who are favored with it rise to the surface, while those who have the leaden jackets do not. Notwithstanding this, Calvinists tell us, with a grave face, that God is not the author of sin! First, because, as they say, it is not God, but the leaden jacket, that causes the wicked to sink; second, because the wicked sink willingly, that is, in going down they will to go down, and take pleasure in so doing; third, if it be urged that the sinking should be imputed, not to the leaden jacket, but to the agency that

fastens it around their waists, still God is not the author of sin, for he binds on the leaden jacket from a good motive, namely, to show forth his power and justice. That is to say, God is not the author of sin, because in issuing his decree he is not actuated by improper motives, does not ordain the sin as an end, but as the means to an end; and, moreover, because there can be no sin for him, since sin is the violation of a law, and he is above all law.

3. The numerous necessary consequences and developments of this doctrine are clearly set forth and accepted by Calvinists. An obvious corollary from it is, that man has no free will, no power to act or not to act, to do good or to do evil, and that every thing in him proceeds necessarily from the decrees of God, in such a manner that it is not his will that chooses, but God's decree that necessarily and inevitably makes him act. Some Calvinists, indeed, admit, in words, the existence of free will in man; but they mean by it merely that man wills what he does, without having any power to do the contrary. If a stone be dropped from a tower, all readily conceive that its falling to the ground is the necessary effect of gravity, and that the stone has no power to rise or to stop. Still, admitting it to have knowledge and will, it would fall voluntarily, willingly, and even delight in falling, according to the law of its nature. This sort of will would proceed from necessity, and it is all the free will Calvinists do or can concede to man. Or take another example. No one who reflects on numbers but must yield his assent to the assertion that two and two make four. A Calvinist will say that this assent is *free*, because voluntary. But persons not versed in Calvinistic subtilties will contend that this is not an example of free will, since we are not free not to yield the assent in question.

4. Other consequences no less remarkable follow, such as that salvation is possible, not to all men, but to the elect only, and though some others may be called externally, they cannot attain to salvation, because the Almighty has predestinated them to evil; that Christ has redeemed, not all men, but merely the elect, and therefore the graces necessary to assist our free will, so strongly inclined to evil since the fall of Adam, are granted to the elect only, and totally withheld from the reprobate; that the grace which is given to the elect imposes on them the necessity of doing good, since, according to Calvinists, it would be impious and blasphemous to assert

that men may resist divine grace, and yet the grace offers no violence to their will, but makes them yield voluntarily, as we yield to the proposition, two and two make four; that the commandments of God are, in many instances, impossible both for the just and the wicked, — for the wicked, in consequence of their predestination and destitution of all grace, and for the just, because God would keep them humble by causing them to fall into sin. All these consequences are clearly contained in the Calvinistic premises, and the statements we have just given comprise the sum and substance of the Calvinistic theology, as laid down by Calvin himself, and as set forth in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, in its "ratified and amended" edition. We have taken no other liberty with it than to divest it of the disguises under which its adherents seek to conceal its hideousness.

5. Now, the very first proposition we take up in the Confession of Faith is, that God has made some men for eternal life and the rest for eternal death. In chapter third, which contains most of the Calvinistic tenets on predestination, it is clearly and explicitly asserted, that "God from all eternity did unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass," and that, "by the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death." Again, "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life God hath chosen, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them. . . . . The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice." The doctrine that God has made some men and angels for the purpose of making them miserable is here unequivocally taught. The effort to conceal it under the phrase "pass by," so that its harshness should not revolt the unprejudiced reader, — a phrase which Calvin would have stigmatized, as invented to disguise a wholesome doctrine, — is fruitless. The whole context exhibits substantially all the tenets of Calvin, and the miserable verbiage adopted fails utterly to conceal them. The Scriptural passages quoted at the bottom of the page are the very ones adduced by the Genevan theologue, with the exception of a few additional texts which have no bearing on the question; and we may, without fear of contradiction, assert, that the

Confession plainly and undeniably teaches the doctrines we have set forth as the Calvinistic.

II. We proceed now to examine and refute the proofs which Presbyterians in their Confession adduce in support of their doctrine. The first proof we will consider is 1 St. Pet. ii. 8, — "Being disobedient; whereunto also they were appointed." The Westminster divines find in this text an express warrant of that leaden jacket with which the Almighty clothes the wicked to make them sink. Here, say they, we find that certain persons were *appointed* by God to be disobedient, unbelievers, reprobates. But it is not said in the text, whether they were appointed by God or by their own malice, through their own free choice; and, for aught that appears, the meaning of the text may be the reverse of what Presbyterians, following Beza, their leader, suppose. They suppose that St. Peter intends to teach that God makes certain men disbelievers that he may send them to hell, which is to make God play the part of the most cruel tyrant. But the text may be rendered, — "Some stumble at the word (the Gospel), being disobedient to that for which they had been appointed." That is, the Gospel had been appointed for the Jews first, — and it is to the Jews St. Peter addresses his Epistle, — and our Saviour commanded his Apostles to preach it to them first, and to announce it to the Gentiles only when the Jews should have rejected it. What mockery, then, to adduce this text as a proof of the blasphemous doctrine that God predestinates men to sin! Erasmus, who cannot be suspected of undue partiality to Catholics, gives the interpretation we have given, and even the English translation will bear the same sense, by making *whereunto* relate, not to the *disobedient*, but to *the word*. It will then simply teach that the scandalous Jews were disobedient to the Gospel which had been destined for them. Hence, the text shows merely that God designed the Gospel to be preached first to the Jews. It is sufficient for our purpose to show that the text *may* receive a consistent sense, according to the rules of grammar, without including the Presbyterian dogma. It is for Presbyterians to show, not only that it *may*, but that it *must*, have the sense they give it, before they can use it as a proof of their cherished doctrine.

The second text, among those adduced in the Confession, which we will consider, is from St. Jude. "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old *ordained* to this condemnation; ungodly men," &c. Here we

cannot mistake the cloven foot. The English translators were so determined to find predestination to sin, that they let slip no occasion of introducing it unawares, as crept in those heretics of whom St. Jude speaks. The text is mistranslated. The Douay version reads, "who were *written* of long ago unto this judgment"; for in the Greek it is not "before of old *ordained*," but *before written*. That is, St. Jude says it had been previously written, foretold, and announced, that there would be heretics in the Christian community. It had been written by St. Paul, St. Peter, by the Evangelists in the name of Christ himself, who tells us to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing, and by the prophets of old, who threaten false prophets with the severest judgments of God. It is not necessary, then, to deduce from this text the abominable doctrine, that God ordained the men of whom St. Jude speaks to the impieties mentioned, and did it that he might condemn them. St. Jude, in the remark so eagerly seized upon by Presbyterians, seeks merely to forestall a difficulty which might arise in the minds of the faithful, namely, If these men creep in *unawares*, how shall we avoid them? He answers, that Christians have been warned beforehand, and that those heretics have been described already by our Lord, the apostles, and the prophets.

The third text we notice appears to be selected with more skill than the two we have just dismissed; but it can afford Presbyterians no support. "The Lord hath made all things for himself; yea, even the wicked for the day of evil." Prov. xvi. 4. If we may believe Calvin and others of his school, this means that God has made the wicked for the purpose of consigning them to eternal damnation, or the day of evil. But Presbyterians cannot adopt this interpretation, without supplying many things not found in the text. They may, indeed, pretend to have the Spirit to direct them in the interpretation of the Bible, but this, whatever it may be for themselves, is nothing to others, and they must sustain their interpretations by arguments which can be addressed to others, before they can expect them to be adopted. The text under consideration is susceptible of a different interpretation, and which requires less to be supplied.* "The Lord has made every thing for himself,

* "Jehovah has ordained every thing for its end;
Even the wicked for the day of evil." — Noyes.

"There is not only a wise arrangement and correspondence in good things, but also in evil things; for the evil of punishment follows the evil of guilt; the evil day is appointed for the evil-doer." — Grotius.

and therefore the wicked shall fall into the evil day." This is the translation of Vatable, who is not unpopular among Protestants, and who cannot be suspected of partiality. Solomon means that every thing turns out for the glory of God, even the punishment of the wicked; but this is something very different from saying that he makes the wicked fall into iniquity for the purpose of punishing them. It is one thing to say that God is glorified in the punishments which he inflicts on the wicked; it is another thing to say that he makes men wicked that he may be glorified in their punishment. The former is compatible with the most perfect justice and goodness; the latter is compatible only with the grossest injustice and cruelty.

The last text we shall examine, and, indeed, the principal text adduced in the *Confession* in support of the doctrine in question, is taken from Rom. ix. This is the great war-horse ridden by Calvin and his associates, and Presbyterians introduce it everywhere, and use it for every assertion, as cooks use salt for every dish. Their use of it shows clearly how shamefully the Scriptures may be perverted, and how dangerous a weapon they may prove in improper hands, as well as why St. Peter said that St. Paul had written in his Epistles things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction. We quote the passage entire.

"The children [Jacob and Esau] being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth; it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger: as it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated. What shall we say, then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion. So, then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharao, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth. Thou wilt say, then, unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay, but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonor? What if God, willing to show

his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy which he had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?"

Here, we are told, is the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, clearly and expressly stated. God predestinated Jacob and damned Esau before either could perform any action whatever. Neither the election nor the reprobation comes through the will or the works of its subject, but through the decree of God, who shows mercy on whom he pleases, and whom he will he hardens. For life eternal or for eternal damnation, we are as clay in the hands of the potter. God hardened the heart of Pharao for the very purpose of showing forth his power in him. But this is the doctrine of Calvin and his school, not of St. Paul. For,

1. The words quoted, if taken without any restriction, involve an evident absurdity. If God rewards or punishes just as he pleases, without respect to desert, and if our eternal lot in no sense depend on our will or works, he might hurl St. Paul himself from his seat in heaven into the deepest hell, merely for the purpose of showing his power, and proving that works have nothing to do with election or reprobation. But this is absurd, and even Calvinists themselves would shrink from the bare supposition of its possibility. To show power by condemning at random, at mere will, is the office of a tyrant, and of a tyrant only, as all men, not deserving a strait-jacket or a lunatic asylum, must necessarily admit.

2. There is a whole class of Scriptural expressions congenial to the peculiar genius of the Hebrew language, and of the Jewish people, which have a harsh, and indeed a false sense, when translated literally into our modern tongues. In the case of these the *letter* indeed *killeth*, and hence the folly of making private judgment the test of Scriptural truth. *I have hated Esau* means in the text merely that *I have loved him less* than Jacob. *Whom he will he hardeneth*, means simply, *whom he will he suffers to harden himself*, or *leaves in his hardness*. Thus our Lord says, St. Luke, xiv. 26, "If any man come to me and *hate* not his father and mother, &c., he cannot be my disciple." These words can only signify that we are to love father and mother, &c., *less* than we do Christ, not that we are positively to *hate* them; for his law forbids us to hate even our enemies, and therefore could not command us to hate our nearest relatives. In Genesis xxix. 31,

it is said that Jacob hated Lia his wife ; but, from the context, and from the well-known disposition of Jacob, who was a just man, it is evident that this can only mean that he loved her less than he did Rachel. So again, Matt. ix. 13, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," means, not that God rejects sacrifices, for he himself instituted and rigorously prescribed them, but simply that he *prefers* mercy to sacrifice. In the same way we must restrict the assertion, that God hardened the heart of Pharao. According to the genius of the Hebrew language, this means only that God *suffered him to harden himself*, or *left him in his hardness*, which Pharao had brought on himself by his own malice. That Pharao did harden himself is certain from the Scriptures themselves, Ex. viii. 15, "But when Pharao saw that rest was given, he *hardened his own heart.*" And in the following chapter, Pharao, softened by the divine punishments, is represented, verse 27, as saying, — "I have sinned this time also" ; but as soon as the judgments cease, it is added, verse 34, "He sinned yet more, and *hardened his heart*, he and his servants." In perfect harmony with this mode of speaking is it that David said, the Lord had commanded Semei, 2 Kings xvi. 10, to curse him, — meaning merely, that he regarded the afflictions which he suffered as a punishment from God, not indeed that Semei had received a revelation or a positive command from God to curse him ; for if so, Semei would merely have done his duty, and David would not have ordered him to be punished for it as he did, when giving his last instructions to his son Solomon.

3. If what we have now said be duly considered, the passage from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans will present no difficulty, and will be seen to have no bearing on the question of predestination, of election or reprobation *in reference to the life to come.* St. Paul speaks expressly and solely of the election of the Gentiles to be the people of God, instead of the Jews, who as a nation had hitherto been that people, or the true church ; and he at the same time asserts positively that both Jews and Gentiles, if they choose, may belong to the new society which our Lord founds as his kingdom on earth. To set this forth is the great, almost the sole, purpose of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, and also of several of his other Epistles. The great objection he had to meet and answer from the Jews, who opposed him everywhere, was, that Christianity could not be the true religion, because the true

religion had been found and still was to be found only among the Jews, since they alone had received the promises. That the purpose of the passage in question is to meet this objection is evident from the fact, that the whole of it is given in answer to the question raised in verse 6 of this same chapter, "Not as though the word of God had taken no effect; for they are not all Israel which are of Israel." Having asserted this, he proceeds to prove that the true Israel are not now the Jews as such, but the Christian people, and that, in substituting the Christian people for the Jewish nation as the people of God, no injustice is done to the Jews; since the true Israel, or Christian people, are collected indiscriminately from both Jews and Gentiles, — "Even us (Christians), whom he hath called not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." ver. 24. This understood, all the passages which to a superficial reader seem to be pure Calvinism have an easy and natural interpretation, conformably to the Catholic doctrine, and even demanded by the context.

Jacob was chosen to be the head of the people of God, and the father, according to the flesh, of the Messiah, in preference to his elder brother Esau, and before either was born or had done any action good or evil, solely and purely because such was the pleasure of God; not from the evil or sin of either Jacob or Esau, but from God's own will or mercy. No injustice in the choice of Jacob to be, and the rejection of Esau from being, the people of God is done to Esau, because the Messiah could not be born of both, and the favor of being chosen to be the father of the Messiah was due to neither; and therefore God could freely bestow it on which he pleased, without the other having any right to complain of being rejected. God every day bestows on some natural favors of genius, wit, riches, &c., which he withholds from others, and without injustice; for no one can claim these favors as his due. But the election of Jacob and the rejection of Esau had nothing to do with the eternal life of one or the other. Esau, though rejected *as head of the people of God*, was still able and bound to worship God, and by doing so could secure eternal life. So his posterity, though shut out from making any part of the chosen people, were not deprived of the ability nor of the obligation to worship God. Hence the words, "I have loved Jacob and hated Esau," are to be understood of them as chiefs of nations, and it is only when they receive a *national* application that they are

verified, as is evident from the fact that they are quoted from Malachias i. 3, who says, — "I have loved Jacob and hated Esau, and have made his mountains a wilderness, and given his inheritance to the dragons of the desert," and from the fact that, though it was said "the elder shall serve the younger," Esau in person never served Jacob, but on the contrary was always treated by him as his superior.

As to the personal salvation of Esau, the text says absolutely nothing. Hence some commentators have inferred that he is saved, as also Ismael the son of Abraham, who also was rejected from being the head of the chosen people. It is very probable that Esau repented of his early cruelty to his brother, and did not die a reprobate. This will appear at least not unlikely to one who reads Gen. xxxiii., which shows us Esau forgiving his brother with frankness and sincerity; and that the reconciliation which took place proved to be permanent may be gathered from the fact, that many years after, when Isaac died, we read, "his two sons, Esau and Jacob, buried him." They who know how bitter and lasting are in general the feuds and animosities of near relations will not think lightly of the disposition Esau manifested when he forgave his brother, and we may gather from the words of our Lord, "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven," a ground of hope that Esau is not lost. His posterity, though excluded from being the people of God, were not excluded from the chance of salvation. They even had their saints and elect; for it is the common opinion that holy Job was a descendant of Esau.

But to return to the Epistle to the Romans. The Apostle adds another reason why the true religion has departed from the Jews as a nation. They hardened themselves as did Pharao, and Almighty God suffered them to remain in their hardness. If the Jew persisted, and asked why God had suffered them to harden themselves, the Apostle answered, that no one has the right to put such a question to God, and the clay has nothing to reply against the potter. Moreover, that they have no ground of complaint; for God has already done more for them than strict justice required, inasmuch as he had borne with long-suffering their hardness before rejecting them; and he now would show his justice and power in punishing their obduracy, and his mercy in adopting the Christians as his chosen people, into the number of which people the Jews had the first offer of entering, and might still enter, if they would, as well as the Gentiles. Thus the comparison

drawn from the power of the potter over the clay extends, in the reasoning of the Apostle, only to the power which God has over those who have already hardened themselves, and should be extended no farther; otherwise we might from it contend that God may hurl the saints into hell, and raise the reprobate to glory. As a general rule, comparisons are not to be urged in every point.

St. Paul is supposed by Calvinists to favor their notion, when, from Ex. ix. 16, he states that God raised up Pharao for the express purpose of showing his power on him for his obduracy; but such an interpretation of the words used betrays only the grossest ignorance of Scriptural language and of the Hebrew idiom. The phrase merely means, that in consequence of Pharao's obduracy God showed his power on him; and on reading the passage in Exodus, it will be found that it was not till after Pharao had hardened his heart that the words were spoken. The same principle applies also to the concluding words of the passage under consideration. "What if God, willing to show his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath?" The sense is not that God endured the vessels of wrath for the purpose of showing his wrath, for the endurance was an evidence of his long-suffering and mercy; but, "What — who has a right to complain — if God now, since he has endured the vessels of wrath, — the Jews as a nation, — be willing to show his wrath and make his power known in rejecting them as the depositaries of the true religion?"

It is evident from these remarks that this famous passage has no reference to predestination, or even to future events, but treats of a fact accomplished in the time of the Apostle, namely, the rejection of the Jewish nation as the people of God, and the substitution of the Christian people taken from both Jews and Gentiles. Of this the Jew had no right to complain, since, as the same Apostle teaches us in his Epistle to the Galatians, the Jews were originally chosen to be the people of God only for a time, which time expired at the coming of Christ, in whom the law of which they had been the depositaries received its fulfilment; because the promise made to Abraham, on which the Jew relied for the perpetuity of his nation as the chosen nation, was to his seed, which is Christ, in whom no national distinctions are recognized; because the Jew had no claim in justice to the prerogative he had enjoyed, since his nation was not chosen in consequence of any merits of its own,

or of its progenitors, for the choice was made while the children were yet unborn, and before either had done good or evil, and of course taking away a prerogative to which he had no claim in justice could be no act of injustice to him; because the Jewish nation had hardened their hearts, and rejected the Gospel, which was offered to them first, and therefore God could justly leave them in their obduracy and turn for his people to the Gentiles; and finally, because the new people of God were not selected in reference to national distinctions, but to faith in Christ. The Jew was deprived by this rejection, individually, of no advantage, but could still be reckoned among the people of God, if he chose, as well as the Gentiles. The Gentiles became the chosen people only by faith in Christ, and the Jews could continue to be his chosen people in the same way, if they willed; but seeing they did not so will, they could not complain, if God, who had borne so long with their obduracy, should, to show his wrath and to make his power known, now punish them for their obduracy by leaving them in it. Understood in this way, the argument is clear and conclusive, and the detached texts which Calvinists wrest in their own favor have a free and natural meaning, without affording any countenance to the shocking impiety and blasphemy, that God predestinates men to sin that he may have the glory of damning them. Their interpretation is, to say the least, perfectly gratuitous, and it is sufficient for our purpose to show that the passages in question will bear a different interpretation.

III. We proceed now to the Catholic doctrine, which stands opposed to the Presbyterian. The Church teaches that God desires the salvation of all men, and that, so far from having made a portion for the express purpose of condemning them to eternal fire, he puts into the hands of all sufficient and abundant means of salvation; that the real author of sin is the criminal will of man, who freely and of his own malice, which he has the power to reject and expel, chooses evil; that Christ has redeemed all men, and obtained graces for all men, by corresponding to which all can obtain heaven; that divine grace imposes no necessity on the human will; and that the commandments of God are possible to all men, the just and the unjust, since God permits no one to be tempted above his strength. These views, to say the least, are in accordance with what our reason spontaneously teaches us of that infinitely perfect Being whom we call our Father.

Such is the general statement of the Catholic doctrine on

the questions involved, but for the present we shall consider it only so far as it is the direct contradictory of the article of Presbyterianism, which we have just seen is unsupported by the texts alleged. The rest will come up in order, after we have examined the evidence Presbyterians adduce in support of the second article of their doctrine, on the "Divine decrees."

The article we have been considering is, that Almighty God predestinates some men to sin, that he may glorify his justice in condemning them to hell. We have seen that the texts quoted to prove this horrid doctrine do not necessarily teach it, and, in fact, have no reference to it. This leaves the doctrine unproved, an unsupported assertion. Against this doctrine stands the Catholic doctrine, that God wills the salvation of all men, and has furnished all with sufficient and abundant means of salvation. If we prove this, we disprove the Presbyterian doctrine by proving its contrary.

That Almighty God has created no one for the sake of condemning him to hell follows so closely and so necessarily from the most obvious and natural conceptions which we have of the Supreme Being, that the attempt to prove it seems ridiculous, indeed, blasphemous. As the punishment of parricide was not found in the laws of Solon, because the crime was not supposed to be possible, so it may be thought such a thesis as this should be banished from Christian theology, as combating a theory which can have no advocates. But — we are ashamed to be obliged to say it — Presbyterians have transcended all bounds, and are even worse than the old Manicheans; for these, at least, excluded cruelty and malice from their conception of God by introducing two principles of things, one good and the other evil. This unquestionably was a madness, but a very reasonable madness in comparison with that of attributing an evil property to Him who is the author of all good, of ascribing cruelty to Him whom the Scriptures, and hence all Christians in their public hymns, praise as the merciful and patient Lord, filling the earth with his mercy and loving-kindness. "The Lord is sweet to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works." Ps. cxliv. 9. Calvin, however, has made this discussion necessary, and on him and his followers must rest its responsibility and its blasphemy. Happily, the proofs of the Catholic doctrine, that God has made no one for the sake of damning him, nay, that he desires the salvation of all men, not of the just only, but of all others also, are so numerous, clear, and convincing, that they

do not and cannot fail to place the cruelty, madness, and absurdity of the Calvinistic doctrine in a clear and strong light.

The sacred Scriptures furnish so many texts expressly to our purpose, that it is impossible for us to quote them all, and it is difficult to make a selection. But we may take Ezech. xviii. 23, as clear and unequivocal. "Is it my will that the sinner should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should be converted from his ways, and live?" The prophet proceeds to argue against those who contend that the ways of the Lord are not right, and declares, verse 30, "Therefore will I judge every man according to his ways"; and concludes the chapter, verse 32, with the assurance, that "I desire not the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; return ye, and live." Is not such language in reference to the impious clear and conclusive? What more could we desire to prove that Almighty God made them, not for the sake of condemning them to hell, but, on the contrary, that they should do good, repent after having sinned, and live?

The same declaration of God's will occurs again, xxxiii. 11, confirmed by a solemn oath. "*As I live*, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live." It is evident from this, that the real cause of the loss of the wicked is their own criminal will, and not the desire or the decree of God to consign them to eternal punishment. The prophet Osee, xiii. 9, says as much: — "Destruction is thy own, O Israel; thy help is only in me"; or, as the Protestant Bible has it, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help." Hence the destruction and the ruin of the wicked come from themselves, from their own malicious course, and the ill use they make of their free will; but the Lord has given them his help to preserve them from the destruction they bring on themselves by their own malice. Also in the same prophet, xi. 9, the Lord says he will moderate the punishment of the wicked Ephraimites, or Samaritans, "because he is God, and not man"; thus showing that it is the essential property of God to remain ever within the bounds of a just punishment. What horrid impiety, then, to assert that he creates some men for the sake of making them sin and burn eternally for it!

The prophet Isaias, xxviii. 21, calls vengeance and punishment "a work strange to him," that is, a work foreign to his nature, and to which he resorts only when our iniquities and malice compel him to chastise us. But on Calvin's theory,

vengeance is the prime mover and first cause of the eternal ruin of the wicked, and therefore should not be called his "*strange* work," but a congenial work, and a work in which he took particular delight from all eternity. When God brought the waters of the flood upon the earth, we are told, Gen. vi. 6, that he was "touched inwardly with sorrow of heart," and that "it repented him to have made man." Are not such expressions ridiculous, and even hypocritical, if we are to assume that God made man expressly in order that he might fall into sin and suffer temporal and eternal punishment for it? Is not that "internal sorrow," said to exist in the heart of God, as conclusive proof as could be desired, that God did not make man for the purpose of damning him, and that his original design has been disturbed and set aside by the folly and wickedness of sinners?

We conclude our quotations from the Old Testament with a passage from the book of Wisdom, which sums up what precedes, and in which the will of God to save all and to damn none is clearly asserted. "Seek not death in the error of your life, neither procure ye destruction by the works of your hands. For God made not death, neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. . . . . But the wicked by works and words have called it to them." i. 12 – 16. "Thou [O Lord] hast mercy upon all, because thou canst do all things, and overlookest the sins of men for the sake of repentance. For thou lovest all the things that are, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made; *for thou didst not appoint or make any thing hating it.*" xi. 24, 25. No writer could condemn the Calvinistic dogma in more express or stronger terms.

We proceed now to the New Testament. This furnishes passages which, if possible, still more clearly and conclusively condemn the impious dogma of Calvin, and prove the opposing Catholic dogma. Our divine Saviour, of whom it was said that he came not to destroy souls, but to save them, St. Luke ix. 56, at the conclusion of the parable of the man who, having ninety and nine sheep in the fold, runs after the hundredth that has strayed, to save it from destruction, adds this maxim, which is the death-warrant of Calvinism: — "Even so it is not the will of your Father who is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." St. Matt. xviii. 14. If, then, one perish, it is contrary to the will of God, and not in consequence of that will, as predestinarians contend. 2 St. Pet. iii. 9 establishes

the same conclusion. "The Lord delayeth not his promise, as some imagine, but beareth patiently for your sake, *not willing that any should perish, but that all should return.*" The reason, then, why God does not punish all the wicked immediately is because his will is that none should perish, but that all should return to him by penance, and live. Hence, they perish only because of their own free will they go against his will to save them.

Many other passages might be quoted to our purpose, such as those in which it is asserted that Christ came "to take away the sins of the world" (St. John i. 29), is the propitiation for the sins not only of the just, but of the "whole world" (1 St. John ii. 2), and "died for all men" (2 Cor. v. 14, 15); but leaving by the way, for the present, the consideration of the fact that Christ died for all, we will close our quotations with a few remarks on St. Paul's doctrine on the subject in question. Presbyterians would fain introduce this holy Apostle as teaching that God hates and hardens whom he will, making some for hell, as the potter makes some vessels for ignoble purposes; but he, in fact, teaches in the clearest and most decisive manner the doctrine that God hates no man without demerit in him, nay, wills the salvation of all men, even of the wicked. In this very Epistle to the Romans, in which Calvinists fancy they find authority for their revolting dogma, he plainly teaches that the judgments of God fall only on those who draw them down on themselves by their own evil doings, that God bears with them, and invites and exhorts them to penance, and that it is their own obdurate and impenitent heart, and not the will of God, to which they owe their condemnation. "We know," he says, "that the judgment of God is *according to truth*, against them that do such things; and thinkest thou, O man, that judgest them that do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgments of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and patience, and long-suffering? Knowest thou not that the benignity of God leadeth thee to penance? But according to *thy hardness, and impenitent heart*, thou treasurest up wrath against the day of wrath, and the revelation of the just judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his works." Rom. ii. 2–6. The passage from beginning to end is the condemnation of Presbyterianism. The goodness, the patience, the long-suffering, the benignity of God, that lead the wicked to penance, must be to all, not wilfully blind, a convincing proof

that God desires the salvation of sinners, instead of compelling them to sin after having foreordained them to everlasting death, as Presbyterians blasphemously allege.

The following passage addressed to his son Timothy is still more to our purpose. "I desire, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, . . . . . for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth." 1 Tim. ii. 1–4. Comments on such a text as this are unnecessary, and would only weaken the impression it irresistibly makes on the reader, that God wills the salvation of all, and that Christ gave himself a ransom for all. What a contrast between this obvious doctrine of the blessed Apostle and that of the Confession, that "by the decree of God some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death"! *

Moreover, it is to be remarked that St. Paul often declares that "with God there is no respect of persons." Rom. ii. 11; Col. iii. 25. The same declaration is also to be found in other parts of the Sacred Scriptures, particularly 1 St. Peter i. 17. "You invoke the Father, him who without respect of persons judgeth every man according to his work." What can be the meaning of such declarations in the view of Presbyterians? These words, we grant, do not imply that God bestows his graces and favors upon all in an equal degree, for the contrary is seen every day in the natural order; one has a remarkable natural facility for the acquisition of knowledge, another is naturally dull. The words do not imply, that, in things not of necessity but of liberality, God may not prefer one to another. If I choose to give alms to one beggar, and not to another, I am not an accepter of persons, for the favor I bestow is due to neither. God bestows spiritual favors on some

* We cannot refrain here from relating, that, when the editor of this journal was about joining the Presbyterian Church, many years ago, he objected to this article of the *Confession*. "So do I," answered the pastor of the church. "It is repugnant to the word of God, and revolting to human reason; and last year, when I was in the General Assembly, I did all I could to get it struck out or modified, but was not able to secure a majority in favor of my motion. However, you need not let it trouble you. What we ask you to believe is not this Confession, but the Bible, and we only put this Confession into your hands as an excellent summary of what we believe to be the teaching of the Bible, without, however, binding you to believe it in opposition to the word of God."

which he does not on others, but without respect of persons. He chooses and calls one to high dignity in the Church, and leaves another in the lowest ranks of the laity ; but in this there is no respect of persons, because the ecclesiastical dignity is due to nobody. But there would evidently be gross respect of persons, if you should condemn one to punishment, without any motive save your own will, because punishment is due only to the commission of a crime ; and it would be the most odious respect of persons conceivable, if you should purposely make one commit a crime in order to have a pretext for punishing him. But this is the respect of persons Presbyterians ascribe to the Almighty.

The view we here take confirms the interpretation we have given to the passage quoted by the *Confession* from the Epistle to the Romans. "I have loved Jacob and hated Esau." There is no respect of persons here, because the honor of being chief of the people of God and father of the Messiah was due neither to Jacob nor to Esau. Again, "Whom he will he hardeneth." When one has once thrown himself into sin and voluntarily hardened his heart, the Almighty may justly and does justly leave him in his obduracy, even by withdrawing some of the graces previously granted. For it would be against all order of justice and providence to say, the more rebellious and sinful one becomes, the greater and more multiplied should be the graces bestowed.

The proofs against Calvinism which we have adduced from our inspired volumes are sufficient ; but the dogma of predestination is so repugnant to reason itself, especially when enlightened and directed by faith, that we cannot refrain from offering a few additional remarks. The wisdom of God is totally at variance with predestination to sin and hell. God, in creating the world, and man his noblest work, must have had a motive, and a motive supremely reasonable and worthy of his infinite wisdom. He made man for an end, and what end we all know, from the very elementary lessons of the Christian religion. One of the first questions put to the child in the Catechism is that which requires him to assign the end of his own creation. "Who made you ? God. *Why* did he make you ? To know him, love him, serve him in this life, and be eternally happy with him in the next." This is the end for which Christians have always believed man was created. But on predestinarian principles the answer here assigned could not consistently be given. The Presbyterian child, to answer in conformity with

the teachings of his sect, must answer to the question, Why did God make you ?— I don't know ; perhaps to offend and disobey him here, and be eternally miserable hereafter. But this answer, which follows rigorously from Presbyterian principles, is so revolting to reason, so absurd, so contrary to the notions which all have of the will of God to save all men, and of their redemption through Christ, that Presbyterians themselves shrink from giving it. In their Larger Catechism, they ask, "What is the chief end of man ?" and answer, "Man's chief end is to glorify God and fully enjoy him for ever." Truth is powerful and will out, in spite of all efforts to conceal it. After having told us in the Confession of Faith that by "God's decree, for the manifestation of his glory, some are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death," they now tell us, in their Catechism, the end of man is "to glorify God and *enjoy* him for ever." If the end of man be to glorify God, then God made him for that end ; then God made all that they might enjoy him ; and then he foreordained none to everlasting death, unless for their own demerits ; for otherwise the end for which he made them would not have been to *enjoy* him, but that they might be separated from him and burn eternally in hell.

Again, a God of infinite wisdom and mercy can hate no being without cause or motive, as is evident of itself. Hence, the royal prophet represents it as a horrid thing that his enemies "hated him without cause." (Pss. xxxiv. 19, lxviii. 5, cxviii. 61.) But if the Almighty from the beginning had foreordained some to everlasting death, he would have hated them without cause. The foreordination is the effect of hatred, of hatred as relentless, as intense, as eternity is long ; for God could not thus foredoom the objects of his love. The question does not turn on a greater or less degree of happiness and glory bestowed upon some and refused to others. For we grant that God might have made us solely for a temporal end, and he has created angels who are superior to men, and angels of different degrees of eminence. He may also have less love for one than for another at his pleasure ; but he cannot *hate* any one at his pleasure. Hatred requires essentially some demerit in the object hated, or else it is injustice and cruelty. Consequently, predestination to hell without motive of demerit in the predestinated, from the mere will of God, is unjust and cruel, which cannot be affirmed of God without absurdity and blasphemy.

Punishment, furthermore, is evidently unjust, unless for a crime committed. This is a most manifest and certain principle of both the natural and the eternal law. But eternal death is the most awful punishment, and therefore to inflict it where there is no crime committed is the most frightful injustice. But there is no difference between inflicting punishment where no crime is committed, and willing the punishment and then causing the crime to be committed that the punishment may be inflicted. Therefore, to suppose that God first wills or predestinates men to eternal death, and then makes them sin or fall into crime that he may inflict it, is charging him with the most frightful injustice. The conclusion is irresistible and undeniable.

Presbyterians tell us that by this predestination to hell God shows his infinite power and his sovereign justice. But who is not revolted at the bare thought of an intelligent being showing his power by punishing and torturing his creatures, not for their offences, but for the sake of showing his power? Cruelty to animals is considered unjustifiable even in men; how much more the infliction of eternal punishment on reasonable beings, for the sake of showing his power, by their Creator? When we read of the treatment the Helotes received from the Spartans, we shudder at the flagrant violation of the rights of humanity. They were excluded from the cities and subjected to severe labor; and, moreover, at a certain period in each year, were flogged, for no crime but simply that of being Helotes. They were made drunk in order to create in the Spartan youth a disgust for drunkenness; and when they were becoming too numerous, the young Spartans were sent to hunt them to death as wild beasts. What a horrible state of society does not this fact disclose! But to the everlasting shame of predestinarians, on their system, the good God, whom we are taught to call our Father, and who reveals himself as the Father of mercies, is made to act in regard to men and angels incomparably worse than this. For before they were created, before they had committed or could commit any evil action whatever, they were predestinated to everlasting death, and the sin they commit was intended, foreordained, as the means of fulfilling the decree which doomed them to the everlasting death! He creates men that he may show his power in damning them, and makes them sin that he may damn them *justly*, show his sovereign justice in their damnation! The bare statement is enough to curdle an ordinary man's blood; what, then, can Cal-

vinists be who profess to believe it? and what must be their views of God, to suppose that such a manifestation of power and *justice* can redound to his glory? Why, even the Devil himself would almost scruple to accept of such glory, and spurn the sycophant who would award it to him.

The Scripture authorities we have adduced, and the reasonings we have offered, are undoubtedly amply sufficient for our purpose; but our conclusion will acquire a firmer hold on the mind, by being invested with the authority of the Church, the seal of truth and correct interpretation of Scripture.

As early as 475, we learn from ecclesiastical history, a priest of the Gallic Church, called Lucidus,* broached errors similar to those of our modern predestinarians. The bishops of Gaul were not slow to bring him to an abjuration of his errors, and in a letter which he wrote to a council of bishops convened at Arles, he expressly condemns his past errors, on account of which the council was assembled. He condemns the assertion, that "Christ had not died for all"; that "the prescience of God condemns some violently to death"; that "those who perish, perish through the will of God"; and that "some are doomed for death, and others predestinated for life." These errors do not seem to have spread far at that time; but we find, a few years later, another council, held at Orange, 529, asserting, "that some are predestinated unto evil by divine power, we not only do not admit, but, if there be any that would admit such great evil, we give them anathema with all detestation."

A monk called Gotescalchus, or Gottschalk, in the ninth century, broached anew the very errors we find in the Confession of Faith. This monk was then residing with Count Eberhard, to whom a learned bishop, Raban of Mayence, wrote:—

"I hear that you keep in your house a certain Gottschalk, who teaches that divine predestination imposes on men such a necessity, that, even if they exert themselves to the best of their abilities, with the help of divine grace, to work out their salvation, they will exert themselves in vain, if they are not predestinated for life; as if God by his predestination impelled men to sin! This doctrine has already thrown many persons into despair. It has made them say, 'What need is there of

---

* Labbe, Conc., Vol. IV., p. 1041.

my working out my salvation ? For in vain shall I be good, if I am not predestinated ; and if I commit sin, predestination will make me reach eternal life, notwithstanding.' "

These sad results of predestinarianism Raban saw only on a small scale ; it was reserved for succeeding centuries to see them exhibited on a large scale. It is needless to add, that Gottschalk was condemned in several councils.* In that of Mayence, 848, the error of this proud monk which was condemned was, that " God predestinates to evil as well as to good, and that there are men dragged to ruin by predestination, as if God had created them to damn them." The Fathers of the Council of Quercy, 849, and of that of Valence, 855, say, " In the condemnation of the reprobate, their bad deeds precede the just judgment of God ; God has foreseen but not foreordained their malice, because the malice comes from them, not from him." " That some are predestinated by divine power to evil not only do we not believe, but if any one do maintain it, we give him anathema." Two centuries later, Pope Leo IX., writing to the Bishop of Antioch, and summing up the principal articles of faith, says, — " I believe God has predestinated only good, and has foreseen good and evil."†

The most holy Council of Trent repeats and confirms the preceding condemnation of the predestinarian heresy ; for it maintains (Sess. VI., c. 2), that Christ died for all, — quoting the words of Scripture, that he gave himself a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world ; and in canon 17 of the same session decrees, — " If any one shall say the grace of justification is given only to those who are predestinated unto life, and that all the rest who are called are called indeed, but receive no grace, because predestinated unto evil, let him be anathema." The venom of the predestinarian heresy is also to be found in the fact, that it asserts the necessity of some to be good, and the impossibility of others to avoid evil, through the want of free will, a point which we shall hereafter consider, and which this holy council has also expressly condemned.

The Presbyterian doctors wind up their chapter on God's eternal decree with the wise admonition, that " the doctrine of this high mystery is to be handled with especial prudence and care." A timely suggestion. They may well make it ; but in making it, they virtually say, " The doctrine is true, in-

* Labbe, Conc., Vol. VIII., p. 52, et seq. † Ib., Vol. IX., p. 977.

deed ; but take care that you do not preach it clearly and on all occasions. It is true ; but it is so harsh, that, if preached, it might bring Presbyterianism into disrepute ; it might make people crazy, and haunt them night and day by a more frightful terror than the sword of Damocles ; it might have an immoral tendency, loosen all moral restraints, and encourage sinners to run into every excess, by assuring them that it can make no difference, since, if they are predestinated unto life, they cannot be lost, and if they are predestinated unto evil, they cannot be saved ; nay, may lull parents, instructers, clergymen, into sloth and lukewarmness, and check all exertions for turning the wicked from the evil of their way, under pretence that the decree of God, in regard alike to those who are to be saved and those who are to be damned, will infallibly be accomplished without any human intermeddling." What do Presbyterians themselves, in this admonition, but condemn their own doctrine, confess its immoral tendency, its incompatibility with social peace, virtue, and order, and that it opens the door to all licentiousness and vice ? Their confession is warranted by their history, and even more disastrous consequences still would have followed, if they had not, in general, proved themselves, through God's restraining grace, better than their principles, and unable to act them out.

But every thing will fall into its place, and peace and confidence, without which success in any undertaking is impossible, will enter the breast, if, instead of this gloomy decree, we bear in mind, — 1. That God sincerely wills the salvation of all men, even since the fall of Adam ; and that even since that fall, as before, the true end of man is to know God, love and serve him, and be happy with him for ever. And Christ has truly died for all, to redeem all without any exception, agreeably to what the Church sings every Sunday at the *Credo*, "for us men, and for our salvation," — *propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem.* Hence, in one sense, it is true and undeniable, that all men — *ante prævisa merita* — are predestinated unto everlasting life, and there is, and there can be, nothing in the decrees of God to render this predestination null or fallacious. Hope is the undoubted privilege of every son of Adam ; for Christ has purchased it for all, even the most inveterate sinner, and truly, entirely, and sincerely ; for it would be the most horrid blasphemy to suppose there is or can be hypocrisy in God. 2. That God foreordained no one to damnation, but that it is man who predestinates himself to hell by his

own wicked works, which it was truly in his power to do or not to do, and which, therefore, he might avoid, and would avoid, if he did not through his own malice choose to do them. These two points are settled in the creed of Leo IX., — *Credo Deum prædestinasse bona tantum, prævidisse bona et mala*, — I believe God has *predestinated* good only, and that he has *foreseen* both good and evil. 3. That the just and the unjust must alike exert themselves unremittingly to obtain their salvation, — the just, because it is written, "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take thy crown," Apoc. iii. 11 ; and because it is also written, Phil. ii. 12, "Work out your salvation with fear and trembling," yet should their heart be free from distrust, for God never abandons us, unless we first abandon him ; * — sinners, because it is written, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way, and live. Turn ye from your evil ways, and why will you die, O house of Israel ?" Ezec. xxxiii. 11 ; and to all is addressed the admonition of St. Peter, "Wherefore, brethren, labor the more, that by good works you may make sure your vocation and election." 2 St. Pet. i. 10. You are all elected and predestinated in the intention of God ; see that you render this predestination effectual by your good works.

These considerations sufficiently dispose of the first article of the Presbyterian doctrine on election and reprobation ; the second article, as given in our general statement, we will endeavour to discuss and dispose of in our next Review, having already detained our readers as long as it may be desirable to detain them for one quarter on so disagreeable, and we may say, so revolting, a subject. Nevertheless, our Presbyterian friends must not regard themselves as slighted. We shall, God permitting, pay them as much attention, for some time to come, as they can desire, or their own views of their importance can demand.

---

* Conc. Trid., Sess. VI., c. 11.

ART. IV. 1. — *The Chapel of the Forest, and Christmas Eve.* From the German of CANON SCHMID. Baltimore : Murphy's Cabinet Library. No. VIII.

2. *Lorenzo ; or the Empire of Religion.* By a SCOTCH NON-CONFORMIST, a Convert to the Catholic Faith. From the French ; by a Lady of Philadelphia. Baltimore : Murphy. 1844.

3. *The Elder's House, or the Three Converts.* New York : Dunigan's Home Library. No. VIII.

4. *Pauline Seward ; a Tale of Real Life.* By JOHN D. BRYANT. Baltimore : Murphy. 1847. 2 vols. 12mo.

CANON SCHMID'S tales are said to be for young persons, but they may be read with equal pleasure and profit by young and old, learned and unlearned. They are simple and unpretending, but exquisitely beautiful, and replete with the unction so peculiar to Catholicity, and which is attainable only by those who have long lived under Catholic influence, and been subdued by the holy discipline of the Church. They have almost a sacramental virtue, as have the writings of all saintly authors, and elevate their readers to those pure and serene regions where the soul enjoys a rich foretaste of heaven. Would that we had more of them.

*Lorenzo* is evidently by a convert, but is, nevertheless, a very interesting and valuable little book, though far inferior to the inimitable tales of Canon Schmid. It wants the ease, simplicity, naturalness, and unction of the good Canon, and its author does not appear to be quite at home in the order of characters to which he wishes to introduce us. He tells us, indeed, of the power of religion to overcome the repugnances of nature, to enable one to sacrifice all that is dearest in life, and life itself, to save even an enemy, — to give calmness and joy in the midst of the severest trials and sorrows, the heaviest calamities and distresses ; and what he tells us is literally true ; but he does not write as one who has realized it in his own spiritual life, and he introduces too much physical weakness, too much nervous sensibility, and too much sighing and weeping, to permit us to believe him on his simple word. The Christian hero counts no sacrifice ; his loss is his gain ; and if he laments any thing, it is that he can make no sacrifice, for in every attempt to make one Almighty God prevents him, and overloads him with rich rewards. In general, however, saving

the marriage of cousins, and of the faithful with heretics, we can cheerfully recommend *Lorenzo* as interesting and edifying.

*The Elder's House* does not appear to be by a Catholic. It wants the Catholic accent, even where its doctrine is not objectionable. The author writes with ease, sprightliness, and occasionally with beauty and strength, and the argumentative part indicates learning and ability. Yet he does not appear to have learned that marriage is prohibited within the fourth degree, and that the Church abhors the marriage of the faithful with heretics. He shows too much favor to the demon revenge, and makes the good fathers of the Society of Jesus spend much more time in the families of rich heretics than is their custom. His Catholicity smacks more of Oxford than of Rome, and his book indicates quite too much hankering after the great, and fawning around the rich. It recommends, indeed, tenderness to the poor, but fails to make us feel that poverty in itself is no evil. Catholicity teaches us not merely to be tender to the poor, but to respect them, and to feel that they may have all that is truly respectable or desirable without ceasing to be poor. We regretted to find the author so familiar with Byron and Bulwer, and that he could represent a well-instructed Catholic as making love to an heretical young lady in the language and superstition of idolatrous Egypt and the East; and we were even scandalized that he should make Florence Ruthven, intended to be a perfect model of a Catholic lady, fall in love with an heretical or infidel scamp, and break her heart and die because he married another. There may be such Catholics as the author introduces, but they should be held up to our pity, not to our approbation.

*Pauline Seward* is a work of some pretension, and not without solid merit. The author, we have seen it stated, is a convert, — a fact we should readily infer from the book itself. It is no easy thing for us, who have had the misery to be brought up out of the Church, to conceal the fact. Our speech betrays us, and we show in our accent that we are naturalized citizens, not native-born. Judging from internal evidence, we should presume the author to be not only a convert, but a recent convert, and that, in sketching the conversion of his heroine, he is portraying the principal features of his own. He is evidently a man of good natural gifts, a scholar of respectable attainments, a cultivated mind, and serious and noble aims. His novel possesses more than ordinary interest, and contains passages of rare beauty and power.

After taking it up, we found ourselves unwilling to lay it down, before reading to the end of the second volume. It is, upon the whole, the most interesting and the least objectionable of any of the popular religious novels, written on this side of the water, that have appeared since *Father Rowland*. Nevertheless, it is not without its faults. As a work of art it cannot assume a very high rank. The characters want individuality, and the dialogue is frequently stiff and awkward. There is too frequent a recurrence of the same epithets, and a little too much *dearing*, embracing, and kissing. An author may leave some things to be supplied by the knowledge or imagination of his readers. The incidents, some of which are very interesting in themselves, are often superinduced upon the main design, instead of being developed from it. The argument is sometimes needlessly minute, at other times quite too summary, and the whole work wants originality. The serious portion is avowedly copied from very common books of controversy, and the romance is hashed up from Bulwer, James, Dickens, and others. The author, moreover, looks with too much forbearance on the marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant, and, in one instance, at least, not necessary to specify, makes a concession to Protestants which is fatal to his whole argument, if strictly taken. But, notwithstanding these faults, the work, as the times go, is very creditable to the author, and leads us to hope for better things from him hereafter.

The last two works we have mentioned belong to that class of religious novels which we criticized with some severity in our last Review. This class of works, under the relation of art, are as offensive as a picture in which the painter joins the beautiful head of a maiden on to the body and tail of a fish. They are literary hybrids, formed by the union of the modern novel or novellette with the theological tract or pamphlet, and as such we have no toleration for them. What we think of them as romances we have heretofore told our readers. But it is not merely as romances, or works of art, that they are to be considered. They have another and a higher aim; and it is in relation to this other and higher aim that we wish now to examine their claims on the Catholic public. Waiving their character of romances, they pertain to the department of polemical theology, and are designed to set forth, recommend, and vindicate the Catholic faith. This is their principal aim. It is proper, therefore, to consider them in this latter character, and to examine with some care their

probable influence, supposing them to be extensively read, both on those who are without and on those who are within. If, under both or either of these relations, they are fitted, here and now, to exert a favorable influence, we must approve them, whatever may be our objections to them as mere romances or works of art.

I. In relation to those without, these works do not seem to us to be of the sort we want. The very fact that they mix up a love-story with the controversy is a drawback upon their good influence. They who are not sufficiently interested in the questions discussed, to read the arguments without the story, will hardly be sufficiently interested by it to read them with profit. They will read for the story, and, if they read the arguments, it will, in general, be as if they read them not. But those who are sufficiently interested to read the discussion with profit would read with more pleasure and profit the same matter without the story. The tone of these works is also against them. Protestants expect us to be less worldly-minded, and to possess more evangelical simplicity and humility, than they, and they are repelled from us just in the same proportion as they find us like themselves. The worldly and aristocratic tone which these works breathe, the hankering after wealth and fashion they exhibit, the care taken to introduce no Catholics upon the scene but such as are rich, learned, refined, or fashionable, in a country like this, where it is well known that the great majority of the faithful belong to the poorer and humbler classes of society, are more likely to disgust and repel intelligent Protestants, already prejudiced against our religion, than to charm and attract them to the Church. They show us too much like themselves for them to draw an inference favorable to Catholicity. These works would have a far better influence, if they laid their scene in some damp cellar, some miserable garret, or wretched shanty, and contrasted the poor Catholic, exiled from the land of his birth and all the cherished associations of his childhood and youth, in the midst of poverty, sickness, labor, destitution, and death, purified, sustained, consoled, made cheerful, joyous even, by his holy religion, with some rich and voluptuous heretic, surrounded by his troops of satellites, educated, learned, refined, with all that wealth and luxury can give, yet tortured by a gnawing within, weary of himself and the world, with no sweet recollection behind, no inspiring hope before, and

seeking to drown the present in gay dissipation or in vice and crime. He who has been an inmate in the houses of our rich and luxurious heretics, undazzled by the splendor of the outside, and able to look beneath the veil of elegant manners and refined hospitality, and who has also witnessed the simple faith and fervent piety of our poor Irish Catholics, sat down with them in their scantily furnished dwellings and shared their warm household affections, loses for ever all his hankering after high life, wealth, fashion, and feels his heart melt in unaffected pity for all whom the world envies.

It is also an objection to these works that they seek to present Catholicity in its resemblance to, rather than in its contrast with, Protestantism. The aim appears to be to make the faith as much like heresy as it can be, and still be called faith. This is very questionable policy, and betrays no profound knowledge of human nature in general, or of American Protestant nature in particular. In proportion as we diminish the differences between Catholicity and Protestantism, we should remember, we diminish, in a country like this, where all the worldly advantages are on the side of the latter, the motives there are for one to embrace the former. The Protestant does not become a Catholic in order to retain what he already has, but in order to get what he has not; and to arrest his attention and induce him to investigate the claims of our religion, we must hold out to him, not what we have in common with him, but what we have which he has not, and cannot have, unless he becomes one of us. Assuredly, few men in this country will abjure Protestantism for the sake of receiving it back under the name of Catholicity.

On this point the works in question seem to us to commit a grave mistake. They adopt too low a tone, and seem to be afraid to present the Church in her imperial dignity and glory, as claiming always to be all or nothing. They appear to wish to conceal, rather than to display, her exclusiveness, — forgetful that it is her recommendation to those without as well as to those within. Men of the world, cold and indifferent as they are, will not listen to the Church, unless she speaks in a tone and language which none of the sects can or dare adopt. The sects are proud and arrogant, but they are also timid and cowardly. When it comes to the point, their courage oozes out, and their speech falters. Not one of them dare say that out of its bosom there is no salvation. They rely, and they know they rely, on man for their support, and they are al-

ways in trepidation lest they should say something which may be offensive to the human pride and prejudice on which they depend. The Church relies on God, and has no fear of men or devils. She speaks in the calm tones of authority whatever she has been commissioned to speak, and remains quiet as to the result. It is this which, more than any one thing else, penetrates the hearts of heretics, and makes them feel that she is not one of the sects, but something totally distinct and diverse from them all.

The great mass of Protestants, as we have known them, of all denominations, have a lurking suspicion that Protestantism is a nullity, — what Carlyle calls a *sham*, — and they cling to the *simulacrum*, only because they persuade themselves that there is nothing more real or less empty to be found. Their position is by no means what they wish it; but they are unwilling to change it, because they have concluded that there can be no other position less unsatisfactory. They place Catholicity among the sects, and look upon all sects as substantially alike; wherefore, then, should they change? It is to this state of mind the Catholic controversialist must address himself, and his first and chief care must be to show that Catholicity cannot be included in the category of the sects, that her Christianity is *generically* distinguishable from that of each and all the sects, from Puseyism to Straussism, and that, under the relation of Christianity, she knows no one of the sects, or if so, only as St. Polycarp knew Marcion as "*primogenitum diaboli*." She will be all, or she will be nothing; and as such should always be presented to the public. When so presented, doubtless the Protestant's first impulse will be to reply with a sneer, — Let her be nothing; but his second impulse, as he reflects on the nullity of his own faith, what he knows of her past history and present condition, the wants of the soul, and the goodness of God, even as manifest by the light of nature, will be to inquire, if, perchance, she may not, in very deed, have the right to be all. It is always better to present the Church in her strength than in her weakness, — as she is and has the right to be, than as shorn of her glory, and compressed into the smallest possible dimensions, for the sake of eluding the attacks of her enemies. There is always less to be apprehended from offending Protestants than from failing to arrest their attention and engage them earnestly in the work of investigation.

These works, furthermore, assume too much as already ac-

cepted by Protestants. It is a mistake, rather than charity, to assume that Protestants in general are in good faith and really concerned about their salvation, and therefore are to be treated always as men who are willing to hear reason and yield to the force of argument. We make also an unwarrantable assumption, when we assume that they generally believe that our Lord has made a revelation, in the strict sense of the word, and instituted some sort of a Church for its dispensation. Individuals there are, among them, who, indeed, believe this much; but, in general, if not always, these are to be regarded as persons who have received a special grace, and who are already on the high road to Rome, whither they are sure to arrive, if they persevere. The bulk of the Protestant world have no solid belief in the fact of revelation, and really admit nothing like a Church in any sense intelligible to a Catholic. There is a *differentia generis* between the views of even your High Churchmen and those of Catholics; Dr. Pusey's notions approach no nearer to Catholicity than the vegetable oyster does to the animal; and, for the most part, one must reason with a Tractarian as if he were a No-churchman.

It is never safe to assume, whatever a Protestant may profess to believe, that he believes any thing with sufficient firmness to warrant us in taking it as our point of departure in an argument against him. The majority of Protestants, it may be, still profess to believe the primary articles of the creed, and we do not question but they really believe that they believe them; but, if we wish to deduce from these articles consequences in favor of the Church, or in favor of any conclusion they are not prepared to believe, we shall find they deceive themselves, and that we are to make no account of their profession. Their belief may be strong enough to bind them by consequences they wish to believe, but never strong enough to bind them by consequences, however legitimate and necessary, to which they are opposed. This cannot surprise us; for we know, and it is one of our strong arguments against heretics, that they who reject the authority of the Church necessarily deprive themselves of all possible means of firm faith, even in those articles of the creed which they may flatter themselves they still retain. We ought, therefore, never to expect them to be bound by the consequences of their own avowed principles. If they cannot deny the necessity of the consequences, we may be sure they will escape conviction by casting doubts, in their own minds, on their premises.

To proceed prudently in our arguments against Protestants, we must reason against them as if we were reasoning *contra gentes*. We must first demolish their idols, show them the vanity of their superstition, and the absolute nullity of what they call their faith ; and then begin and build up an argument for the Church from the very foundation. We can presume nothing. It is labor lost to quote the Holy Scriptures against them. They are too far gone to be affected by prophet or Apostle. They will dispute the application of the prophecy, and gravely tell you, that, in their opinion, the Apostle, if he agrees not with them, was mistaken, or did not fully understand the doctrine he was inspired to teach !

Nor must our readers suppose that this is true only of those commonly called *Liberal Christians*. What we say does not apply only to Unitarians, Rationalists, and Transcendentalists in New England. These are as good Protestants as there are in the country, and though they may be a little bolder in their statements, or less disposed, or less able, to deceive themselves, they are far from differing generically from Protestants in general. We shall look in vain for an essential difference between Andover and Cambridge, Professor Stuart and Professor Norton, or between these and Dr. Strauss and his followers at home or abroad. Dr. Potts of St. Louis even quotes with approbation Michelet and Edgar Quinet, two notorious infidels. There is more unity in the Anticatholic world than we always suspect. Go where we will, whatever the form professed, at bottom we shall find the same want of that firm adhesion of the mind which Catholics understand by the term faith. It is true, converts from the ranks of Episcopalians and Presbyterians may be disposed, in some instances, to question this statement ; but the testimony of converts in favor of their former associates, as well as against them, is to be taken with some grains of allowance. They know what was true of themselves, and from that they are too apt to conclude what is true of those with whom they were associated, — forgetting that themselves received special grace, which gave them, if not faith, at least a certain preamble to faith, and that they have been brought into the Church, while the others have remained outside. We rest our conclusion not on the testimony of converts, nor on our own individual experience while a Protestant. When we find men avowing principles from which the Church is logically inferable, and yet refusing to admit it when it is clearly shown to them to be so inferable, we at-

tribute it, not to the inability to perceive the legitimacy and necessity of the inference, but to a secret distrust of the premises from which it is drawn.

In consequence of overlooking this fact, these works, as controversial works, have but little value. They do not go to the root of the matter, and reach the real difficulty under which the Protestant mind labors. Indeed, this may be said, to some extent, of all the works in our language on the points controverted between Catholics and Protestants. None of them are ultimate enough, and, unhappily, the greater part of them are directed specially against Anglicanism, which, if the most vulnerable, is by no means the dominant form of heresy among Protestants. They all, or nearly all, seem written for a bygone age, and to proceed on the hypothesis, that the old Protestant formulas have in general some significance for their adherents. This is a serious defect; and if we are to have controversial works, their authors should study to give us works adapted to the present state of opinion and prejudice in the Protestant world, — at least, to what it is when they commence writing.

A still more serious objection to these works is, that they make no account of the necessity and agency of grace in the fact of conversion. To read them, one would think conversion is a purely rational or human process, and that nothing is more simple and easy than to convert a Protestant. The facility with which they effect conversions — on paper — is marvellous. Rich heiresses, crabbed old papas, and sour old uncles, and wild young men, and giddy young girls, are all subdued by a few commonplace arguments, and made devout and edifying Catholics. But conversion is no merely rational or human process. In vain we reason, in vain we prove every point, in vain we refute every objection, if grace be not present to open the understanding and incline the will. Till grace operates and dispels the mist which the Devil throws before the eyes of his children, they can see nothing opposed to his kingdom, though as plain as that two and two are four. They have eyes, but they see not, — ears, but they hear not, — hearts, but they understand not. Converts whom God has, in his great mercy, brought from darkness to light, from death to life, are prone to forget this. We fancy the path by which we came was plain and smooth, straight and continuous, and that nothing is easier than to point it out to our neighbours and persuade them to walk in it; but we overlook the fact, that it was grace which made it

so, and enabled us to walk in it without stumbling. Where grace is operative, all is indeed smooth and easy. It is marvellous how readily all difficulties give way, how obvious and beautiful the truth appears, how suddenly, and of themselves, all objections vanish. Strange we did not see this before! How could we be so blind? How could we regard that objection as pertinent, or that argument as solid? It is grace, not human reason, that makes the crooked straight, and the rough even. How, then, without grace, shall the unbelieving or the misbelieving feel the force of our arguments? Or why shall we be astonished that they see not as we see? When we were in their shoes, we saw no more than they do; and why should we ask them to see what, when we were as they, we saw not?

But grace is always ready to assist all, if they wish it. Undoubtedly, and therefore all may see and believe if they will, and it is purely their own fault if they do not. But they cannot do it without grace, and whatever tends to make them rely on the rational process hinders, instead of furthering, their conversion. Their present difficulty is, that they rely on this process, and, not finding it leading them to the Church, conclude that the Church is against reason, and that they are justified in refusing her obedience. These books, by overlooking or making no account of the necessity of grace, have a natural tendency to confirm them in this conclusion, and therefore as fatal a tendency, so far as concerns those without, as they could possibly have.

There is no use in presenting arguments to one who is not predisposed to listen and to receive the truth. Prior to faith, there must be a preparation for faith; and till there is this preparation, the arguments we present for faith itself will have no weight, for the mind is blinded to their conclusiveness. The first thing to attempt to produce, in the case of those not already prepared by their interior disposition to receive the truth when clearly presented, and with sufficient motives of credibility, is this interior disposition itself, which is the work of grace only. The motives to be presented in their case are not motives to believe, but motives to seek by prayer and humiliation the grace that disposes to believe. The necessity of this grace should always be insisted on, its readiness and willingness to aid all who do not resist it should be set forth, and the means of coöperating with it explained and pointed out, and their adoption seriously and solemnly urged. Conversion, if conversion, is no human work. "Convert us and we shall

be converted." We do not come, we are brought; and in a way which is always a mystery unto ourselves. We cannot explain the process. All we can say is, Whereas we were blind, we now see. It is not our doing, but God's doing, and his alone be the praise and the glory. This fact needs to be known by those without, that they may be induced to look not to themselves, but to God, for illumination.

It is true, these works, in general, recognize the necessity of some preparation for receiving arguments for the faith; but, unhappily, they seek the predisposing cause where it is not, and cannot be. They seek it in the human affections, in love, friendship, sympathy, social or domestic influence,—all of which are human, unable to generate grace, and, when sought without grace, are only an obstacle to its operation. It is impossible by these to prepare the mind and the will to receive the truth; for their tendency is oftener to blind and pervert than to enlighten and correct. The motives to be urged are not to be found in the modern novel, but in ascetic theology. And here is the grand mistake of our authors. If they sought to combine the ascetic or the moral with the dogmatic, if they sought the interest of the story in moral or ascetic truth, instead of love and romance, their works would have, with the blessing of God, a tendency to predispose the will to coöperate with grace, and consequently a favorable influence in effecting conversions. But as they are, they seem to us better adapted to keep men out of the Church than to bring them into it.

II. Nor are these works better adapted to exert a wholesome influence on those within. Controversial reading is not, in general, that which is the most edifying to the faithful. The constant reading of controversial works tends to withdraw their attention from the practical part of theology, and to fix it on the speculative; to cultivate acuteness and strength of intellect, rather than pious affection; to make them able and skilful defenders, rather than devout followers of the faith,—hearers, rather than doers of the law; and it requires more than ordinary grace to be able to withstand its dry and withering influence. Controversy is not the genius of Catholicity. It may sometimes be necessary, and when and where it is, she does not shrink from it; but she refers it to those whose special vocation it is, and would, in the main, confine to them the task of defending the faith, and of guarding the flock over whom the Holy Ghost has placed them, against the subtlety and craft of their enemies.

She has no desire to see the great body of the faithful become able and expert disputants, for she knows that it is no gain to a man to be able to argue convincingly for the faith, and to silence the heaviest batteries of its enemies, so long as he does not practise it. It suffices for the faithful at large to know their faith and to obey it. Prayer, meditation, frequenting the sacraments, visits to our Blessed Redeemer who abides in our tabernacles to enlighten, console, and bless us, and works of charity, mercy, and mortification, are their best arguments for the truth, and their surest safeguards against error.

It is worth remarking, that they who fall away fall not from the faith till they have first fallen from its practice. Prayer is neglected or cut short, the confessional is forsaken, assistance at mass becomes irregular and infrequent; then doubts begin, bad books and evil companions are relished, faith is abandoned or stifled, and the apostate fancies that he is emancipated, and, because his vision is narrowed or blinded, that he is enlightened, that he is a philosopher, one of the free and choice spirits of the age. Now he talks largely of ignorance and craft, bigotry and superstition, looks with contempt on the simple faith and holy life of his fathers, sneers at Holy Church, and speaks big words in swelling tones to the priests of God's house, becomes deaf to the voice of conscience, and rushes on in mad license, through Protestantism or infidelity, to hell. Such is the process by which one loses his faith and his soul, — not because he did not know his faith, not because he was unable to answer the objections raised against it, but because he would not obey it; because he yielded to the temptations and seductions of the world, the flesh, and the devil. It is pious affection, not intellectual acuteness and strength, that is most needed; and this is seldom, if ever, promoted by controversial reading.

What we say of controversial reading in general, we may say *à fortiori* of the class of works, in particular, on which we are commenting. They are evidently written on the principle of the "sliding scale," and tend to turn the mind outward, to fix it on our religion as it is likely to be regarded by its enemies, and, in our age and country, to reduce it to its minimum. This is a grave objection. The disposition to ask, How little will answer? can be excused in those who are investigating the claims of the Church, but it is always inexcusable in the faithful themselves. There are, as every Catholic is presumed to know, some things which, though the Church does not positively command them, it is pious to believe and do, and

our good Mother is always pleased to see in us the disposition to believe and do them. The pious son or daughter is never willing to stop with what is positively commanded, but seeks always to be more perfect than the law, and to do not only all our dear Mother bids, but all she wishes. The disposition to be more perfect than the law is peculiarly Catholic, and every one who is livingly a Catholic manifests it always, and in all directions. Is there any thing more than is commanded which the Church would be pleased to have him do, he runs to do it ; any thing more than is strictly enjoined that it is permitted to believe, that it is pious to believe, that she wishes him to believe, his mind and his heart leaps to embrace it. His faith is broad and generous, and tends ever to a sublime excess. Those who are without regard him as of too easy a faith, and sneer at him as credulous ; but this does not affect him ; for he does not look to them for instructions, and they are the last people in the world he would resemble, or whose judgments he would respect. This disposition, the mark of a lively faith and an ardent charity, is most consoling to our dear Mother. It gladdens her maternal heart to see her children manifest it everywhere and on all occasions, as it does the hearts of our natural mothers to see us eager to do not only all they bid, but all they wish ; and she is grieved to see them manifest a contrary disposition, showing themselves close and stingy in their faith, love, and obedience, and careful always to inquire, How little will do? How far can this article be pared down without incurring censure ? Such a disposition indicates that faith is weak, that charity is cold and languid, and excites the apprehension that both in the hour of trial may be found wanting. Our good Mother does not grieve that we do no more, but she grieves at our disposition to do no more, at our willingness to persuade ourselves that we have done all when we have done only the least that is required or that will be accepted.

This uncatholic disposition to ask, How little will do ? and to be satisfied with ourselves when we have done only the least, is, to some extent, characteristic of our times and country. It is one of the principal temptations to which we are exposed, one of the most formidable enemies we have now and here to combat. There are too many among us who seem to cultivate it on principle, and who approach as near the confines of heresy as they can without overleaping them. They appear to study to make Catholicity as near like Protestantism as they can

without destroying her indentity. They confine her long, flowing locks beneath a close Quaker cap, force her feet into a little pair of Chinese shoes, compress her waist in stout whalebone stays laced up by machinery, bid her put on a demure look, and mind and not speak above her breath, and, placing her a low stool in the obscurest corner of the drawing-room, turn to receive their gay, fashionable, and accomplished heretical friends. If one of these, in walking about, chances to espy her, they exclaim, "Don't be alarmed, dear friend. She is on her good behaviour. She can't bite or scratch. There can be no huge teeth in that pretty little mouth, so like the mouth of one of your own high-bred and gentle daughters; and her nails, you see, are pared down to the quick. Don't be alarmed."

These worthy people feel that it is necessary to keep their eligion always in proper trim to be presented to their respectable heretical friends and visiters. They are people of the world, and they share in the passions and tendencies of their age and country. They are liable daily and hourly to hear their religion reviled, their children jeered because children of Catholic parents, and objections urged, many of which it is not pleasant to hear, nor always convenient to stop and answer. Why should they not, then, seek to make Catholicity present as few points objectionable to her enemies as possible? Some of them have a very dear friend, a father, a mother, a wife, or a husband, who is a heretic, yet perhaps, humanly speaking, warm-hearted, kindly disposed, whose feelings and prejudices must be respected, and with whom they would live in peace and love. How can they adopt, or be willing that others should adopt, a high, stern, and uncompromising Catholic tone? Perhaps the matters they hear most frequently objected to do not appear to them to be of vital importance. Why, then, insist on them? Why be always bringing out those very things which our "separated brethren" are the most prejudiced against? What need of being so bigoted and unyielding? These peculiarly offensive things may be well enough where there are none but Catholics, but here they only add to the unpleasantness of our position, and widen the breach between us and our "dissenting Christian friends," and can only do harm. You are imprudent, and drive them away from us by your ultra-catholic tone and sentiments. They are very respectable people, very sincere Christians in their way, and no doubt would be very good Catholics, if they only had the opportunity of learning the truth. We must be charitable and conciliatory.

Some of them even speak well of us. Only the other day, the distinguished Mr. Goldencalf was heard to say he "did not think Catholics were so bad as they had been represented," and Master Goldencalf said he "did not care a fig whether one was a Catholic or a Protestant," and Miss Goldencalf is actually receiving her education in one of our academies for young ladies. The country is becoming every day better disposed towards us. There is a more liberal tone. The age itself is growing more enlightened and tolerant; old animosities are passing away, a better feeling is springing up between Catholics and Protestants, and we trust that we shall prove, in this enlightened and happy country, that Christians, though they cannot all think alike, can agree to differ, and live in mutual peace, love, and esteem.

Now, in a country like this, there will always be large numbers of people who will think and speak in this manner, without once suspecting that they are only repeating the Socinian and Liberal cant of the day. Peace is beautiful, and we are always to follow after the things which make for it; but peace is founded in truth and justice, and there is and can be no peace out of Jesus Christ. It is the peace of the Lord which was left with the faithful, and which they are to study to merit and preserve. The Church, in this world, is the Church Militant, and does and must wage a deadly warfare with falsehood, error, heresy, sin, iniquity; and her children forget their love and fidelity to her, when they shrink from this warfare, seek to divert her from it, or show the least disposition to strike hands or sound a parley with her enemies. All the faithful are soldiers enlisted for the fight, during the war, and not one of them can retreat without dishonor, not one of them ever hope to be able to put off his harness and ground his arms, so long as life remains. The victor's crown is only for those who persevere unto the end.

Nevertheless, such people as we have described there are, and probably always will be, — for scandals will remain unto the end of the world; and these will always study to conceal their cowardice, their lukewarmness, or their indolence and love of ease, under the respectable names of prudence, liberality, and sometimes even that of holy charity. They will be an incubus on the breasts of their more zealous brethren, and justify themselves on the ground that they are conciliating and winning over those without, when in reality they are only ceasing to offer them any opposition. They will consider their faith, al-

most exclusively, as something to be presented to others, and made as unobjectionable as possible to the world in which they live. Naturally, then, and with perfect consistency, taking their point of view, must they always ask of each article of faith, of every statement of Catholic doctrine, How will this strike our separated brethren? What must they think of it? What can they say against it? What will they think of *us*, if told that *we* hold it? Anxious to avoid opposition, to have the task of defence as light and as easy as possible, they will necessarily study to explain and qualify away all the peculiarities of their faith, because it is precisely the peculiarities that are objected to; and thus be always laboring to reduce Catholicity, as we have said, to its minimum.

This tendency is already strong. Pour in upon us now a mass of books which spring from this tendency, which are written in perfect harmony with it, which never protest against it, never even intimate that it is dangerous, or not strictly and genuinely Catholic, and which keep our minds turned outward, not to oppose the enemies of God and his holy Spouse, but to conciliate them by showing them that we are not so far gone as they suppose us, and have more in common with them than they give us credit for, — presenting always the faith as something objected to, not as something which one already has, is to keep, be contented with, and to enjoy, — and it is easy to see what must be their influence, so far as they have any, and that they cannot fail to be deeply prejudicial to Catholic faith and piety. Such are, in general, the works we are considering; and hence the reason why, in our judgment, they are as little adapted to the edification of the faithful as to the conversion of the unbelieving and heretical world around us.

Nor is this all, — *Facilis descensus Averno*. The momentum we acquire in descending to the minimum may, if we are not on our guard, carry us below it. When we proceed on the principle, not of arraigning the enemies of our faith, attacking them in the very principle of their objections, and of compelling them to defend themselves against the charges of rebellion, malice, and falsehood, but of explaining and qualifying our doctrine so as to elude their objections to it, we are in great danger, unless we are learned and exact theologians, of going beyond the line. The declivity is so steep, and we descend with such fearful rapidity, that it is not always easy to arrest ourselves at the precise moment, and at the precise point. If we are not much mistaken, so far as concerns the general reader, and as

they are sure to be interpreted by the latitudinarian tendencies of the age and country, these works sometimes arrest their descent not until it is too late, and not till they have descended into the abyss below. In explaining and qualifying such articles as are peculiarly offensive to Protestants, they not unfrequently weaken, if not entirely destroy, their force and meaning, at least to the great majority of their readers.

We do not recollect one of these popular works which ever ventures to say, "Out of the Church there is no salvation," and there stop, as does the Church herself, as does our holy Father, Pius the Ninth, in his Encyclical Letter; but all of them, whenever they have occasion to introduce this dogma, are careful to accompany it with an explanation, which, in our age and country, eviscerates it of all its Catholic significance for the people at large, whether within or without. Thus, in the second work on our list, we read, — "We know that out of the Church there is no salvation; but many are they who, by want of opportunity of learning the truth, innocently adhere to error, and *thus are in spirit members of the Church.*" Here the qualification to the general reader negatives the dogma, and makes the assertion that out of the Church there is no salvation appear a mere rhetorical flourish. There are few people, not versed in the distinctions and subtilties of the schools, who in these latitudinarian times can read this qualification, expressed here in its least exceptionable form, and not gather from it a meaning wholly repugnant to faith. The conclusion the author draws, moreover, is not warranted by his premises. Undoubtedly men may innocently adhere to error, — but it does not *therefore* follow that they are in spirit members of the Church; for a man, though not in sin by reason of his error, may yet be in error by reason of his sin. It may be, that, if he had complied with the graces given him, and which are given to all men, he would have had the opportunity of being enlightened and brought to the knowledge of the truth. It is possible, then, that the reason why a man is not an actual member of the Church is his own fault, — not, indeed, the fault of not knowing what he had no opportunity of learning, but of not complying with the graces given him and with which he was bound to comply, — and we presume no one will pretend that he is *in spirit* a member of the Church, who through his own fault is not an *actual* member.

We are, indeed, authorized by our religion to judge no one individually, and we never have the right, without a special

revelation, to say of this or that man that he is eternally lost; but faith declares that out of the Church there is no salvation. We are all commanded to hear the Church, and Almighty God gives to all the grace needed to obey his commands; and the presumption is, therefore, always against all who live and die out of her visible communion. Certainly no one will ever be condemned for not doing what it was never in his power to do, or for not believing the truth he had never had an opportunity of learning; but, since the providence of God in this matter must count for something, and we are never at liberty to take the simple human element alone, it is not easy to say precisely what is or is not the extent of the possibilities in the case. In no case is the opportunity of learning the truth ever furnished except by the providence of God, and it costs him nothing to furnish it whenever and wherever he sees that it will not be rejected. You must suppose the man prepared in his interior disposition to embrace the truth as soon as it is presented to him, or you cannot claim him as a virtual member of the Church; but when you have supposed the disposition, are you sure that you have the right to suppose the non-possibility of the opportunity? If the opportunity is withheld, can you say it is not withheld because there was no disposition to profit by it? Can you adduce a case of a man having the disposition and dying without the opportunity? Such a man, you say, had no opportunity of hearing of the Church, and yet he had the disposition. How know you that he had the disposition? From his own statement, and the fact that the missionary found him with it. The missionary found him, then? Then the opportunity was furnished, and your case is not in point. But if the man had died before the missionary came ——. How know you, that, supposing his good disposition to remain, it was possible in the providence of God for him to die before the missionary came? It may be that God would not let him die before, any more than he would holy Simeon before he had seen his salvation, and that he would not is presumable from the fact that he did not. You say there are large numbers in schismatical and heretical communions who are not guilty of the sin of schism or heresy. Be it so. But how know you that God will ever in his providence suffer any of these to die without an opportunity of being formally reconciled to the Church, — or that, if he suffers one to die in those communions, without such opportunity, it is not because he is in mortal sin?

As Catholics, we know nothing of the fiction of an invisible Church, for which heretics in our day contend, and which is composed of the elect of all communions, — the subterfuge to which they were driven, when pressed to tell where their church was before Luther and Calvin. The Church which Catholics believe is a visible kingdom, as much so as the kingdom of France or Great Britain, and when faith assures us that out of the Church there is no salvation, the plain, obvious, natural sense of the dogma is, that those living and dying out of that visible kingdom cannot be saved. This is the article of faith itself, what we are bound to believe under pain of mortal sin ; it is what the fathers taught, — "*Habere non potest Deum patrem*," says St. Cyprian, "*qui Ecclesiam non habet matrem*" ; — and where this is concealed or explained away, — as in the Grand Duchy of Baden, for instance, — faith becomes weak, charity languishing, and Catholicity hardly distinguishable from one of the sects. Theologians may restrict the language of the dogma, they may qualify its apparent sense, and their qualifications, as they themselves understand them, and as they stand in their scientific treatises for theological students, may be just and detract nothing from faith ; but any qualifications or explanations made in popular works, as the general reader will understand them, especially when the tendency is to latitudinarianism, will be virtually against faith ; because he does not and cannot take them in the sense of the theologians, and with the distinctions and restrictions with which they always accompany them in their own minds. We never yet heard a layman contend for what he supposed to be the theological qualification of this article of faith, without contending for what is, in fact, *contra fidem*. We can teach the whole faith, and must teach the whole faith ; but, do our best, we cannot teach the whole of theology to the common people. They may be firm and enlightened believers, and that is enough for them ; but they cannot become exact and accomplished theologians. There are a great many truths, and important truths to the scientific, which we can teach only to those who, by previous moral and mental discipline, are prepared to receive them. We may suppose we are teaching these truths to others, but we deceive ourselves ; for the truth in our mind becomes falsehood in theirs. This deserves more consideration from some from whom we look for better things, than they seem, if we may judge from their writings, to have given it.

We do not dispute the doctrine intended to be taught in the extract we have made from *Lorenzo*. We are not theologians by profession, and it is not our province to decide theological questions. Indeed, the gist of our complaint is, that popular writers do undertake to decide them, instead of confining themselves, as they should, to the simple dogma as the Church propounds it, concerning which there is, and can be, among Catholics, no dispute. The theological doctrine, as understood by those *theologians* who contend for it, we respect, as in duty bound. It is not to it as they understand it, that we are objecting, but to it as understood by the people at large, who learn it, not from theological works where it is treated at length, and the proper restrictions are made, but from brief, loose, and unqualified statements in popular novels, periodicals, newspapers, and *manuals*, — for, unhappily, many of these last are not always careful to distinguish between the dogma and the theological opinion. As hastily caught up from these, by careless, half-educated, and unreflecting readers, already deeply imbued with the prevailing latitudinarianism of the day, it becomes practically false and hurtful; for it is practically understood as if it meant that a man may be saved in any communion to which he is sincerely attached, and whose teachings he does not doubt.

Indeed, the plea of invincible ignorance is not unfrequently so extended as to cover the case of every one in any communion external to the Church, who could hope to be saved according to the teachings of that communion itself. *Thornberry Abbey*, in many respects an excellent little book, represents the good priest as sorely distressed, because he had, in a conversation not of his own seeking, pointed out to a Puseyite young lady the invalidity of Anglican orders. He was afraid that he had gone too far, and had endangered the poor girl's salvation by taking away the invincibility of her ignorance! The authoress of the *Catholic Story* makes no bones of sending to heaven as rabid an old heretic — to all appearance — as ever lived, — one who was filled with hatred of Catholicity, who withdrew his love from his wife, and refused to speak to, or even to see her, after her conversion, thus violating even the law of nature; and who, when his only daughter, to whom he had transferred his affections, was also converted, became perfectly frantic with wrath and hatred, made himself sick, and went off and died, without the least sign of repentance, regret, or forgiveness. And yet the

Catholic wife is made to say, and to defend it as Catholic doctrine, that she had no doubt that he had gone straight to heaven, for she was sure he would have embraced the truth, if he had only had an opportunity of learning it! And this is to be said of a man of rank, of education, of extensive reading, living close by the Church, and having a wife and daughter converted and instructed in his own house! Far be it from us to judge the old sinner, but if he was in invincible ignorance, we should like to know who, not brought up in the Church, may not be, if he chooses; and if such a man, dying unchanged, goes straight to heaven, what is the use of hell, or even of purgatory? The poor authoress had heard something about invincible ignorance, and persons who, though out of the visible communion of the Church, are yet in spirit members of the Church, and only half understanding what she heard, broaches a doctrine which makes the dogma, out of the Church there is no salvation, perfectly ridiculous. The article entitled *Reasons for adhering to the Roman Catholic Religion*, to be found in the *Garden of the Soul*, the *Ursuline Manual*, *Key of Paradise*, and we know not how many more of our popular manuals, goes almost as far. As understood by theologians, it contains nothing formally *contra fidem*, as is to be presumed from the fact that these manuals are published with episcopal approbation; but we have had it frequently quoted against us by persons in and out of the Church, in support of a doctrine of which the best we could say was, that it was *not* Universalism, but which reminded us too forcibly of the latitudinarianism we preached when a Unitarian.

"I believe I have been wrong," said a Catholic lawyer and politician to us the other day; "we have, some of us, been laboring here, for some time, to liberalize the Church. It occurred to us, that the Church, having grown up in other countries and other times, might have incorporated into her constitution many things, which, since they are opposed to the genius of the age and country, and are those things most frequently thrown in our faces, she might consent to modify or reject altogether. We wished her, in a word, to conform to the enlightened and liberal spirit of modern society; and we regretted to find the authorities opposed to us, and, while there was progress everywhere else, absolutely refusing to admit any progress into the bosom of the Church herself. We were honest and sincere; we really believed that the policy we recommended would diminish the repugnance of the people

to becoming Catholics, enable us to take a more active part in the movements of the age, and accelerate the spread of Catholicity through the land; but I begin to suspect that we were wrong, and that, since the Church is of God, the true policy is to labor to bring the people up to her, not her down to the people."

Our legal friend characterized precisely the spirit and tendency these popular works seem to us to encourage, and against which we seek to place our readers on their guard. The Church, however, we admit, adapts herself to time and place; but in a contrary sense. Her spirit is always to insist with the greater firmness and energy on that particular truth which the genius of the age and country most opposes. She concedes that peculiar tendencies demand a peculiar application of truth; and hence what she requires of us, here and now, is to bring out and state, in the greatest prominence possible, those very truths which stand opposed to our dominant errors and tendencies; because it is only these truths which can resist them, and because these are precisely the truths which here and now we are the most liable to lose sight of. To throw these truths into the background, or to bring out in bold relief those views which offer no special resistance to the reigning errors and tendencies, however wise it may seem to men of the world, is a base desertion of the post of danger, and even a narrow and short-sighted policy; for the public mind may change to-morrow, and a new set of errors and tendencies be uppermost. There may be times when it is not necessary to repeat the dogma, out of the Church there is no salvation, because there may be times when every body believes it, and there is no tendency to doubt it. In such times the theological explanation even may accompany it; for then no one will misinterpret or misapply it. But when, as with us, the tendency is all in the direction against it, the dogma requires to be stated in the broadest and most unqualified terms the truth permits; for it is only when so stated that it does not convey to minds in general less than the truth.

The temptation to conform to the spirit of the age, we know, is strong, but we must be firm against it. The age boasts of liberality, but under this liberality we see the curse of indifferency. The real tendency is to the conclusion, that salvation — if salvation there be — is attainable in any form of religion or in none. The tendency we have pointed out among Catholics, and which seems to us to be encouraged by

the popular explanations and qualifications of the dogma of exclusive salvation, is in the same direction, and, at bottom, identical with it. It is, therefore, a tendency to be resisted, not fostered. Nothing can be more fatal, and it is not we alone who say so. God himself, speaking by his Vicegerent on earth, in the recent Encyclical Letter, addressed to all the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the world, and through them to all the faithful, has pointed this out as one of the special and formidable evils of our times, and commanded, nay, entreated, us to resist it with all our strength and energy. Now, all this ingenious speculation, all this refining on faith, and refusing to present the dogma which is opposed to this formidable evil without so explaining and qualifying it that it offers no longer any opposition to it, is not only not resisting it, but actually encouraging and augmenting it. We take up our popular publications, we look for some condemnation of the evil, for some bold proposition of the faith against it; but, alas! we look in vain. We find, perhaps, a glorification of the age, or a side blow at the earnest-minded Catholic who, in the simplicity of his faith, protests against it, — rarely any thing better. Our authors have nothing to say against the fatal latitudinarianism now so rife, but waste their time and strength in denouncing bigotry and intolerance. Yet bigotry and intolerance are not the besetting sins of the times, and what we say against them is much less likely to moderate them in our enemies than to produce laxity of doctrine in the faithful themselves. There is more hope of a bigot than of a latitudinarian. He who cares enough for his religion to oppose its enemies gives evidence that it is possible that he has some shreds of a conscience left. The Church has less formidable enemies to contend against when she is openly persecuted, than when there is a state of general religious indifference, or a general disposition to accommodate faith to the tastes and prejudices of her enemies. St. Hilary preferred Nero and Decius to Constantius, and the persecution of the former to the patronage of the latter.

For our part, we always prefer the man who is either cold or hot to the one that is lukewarm. We like the man of strong convictions, who has the courage to act up to his convictions. We cannot condemn a true principle because it is claimed and abused by those who have no right to it. In reading the *Elder's House*, we did not sympathize with the abuse heaped upon the heretical lady for refusing to marry

the man she loved because he was a Catholic. We honored her for her correct principle, and pitied her Catholic lover for his want of it. If there is any thing about which a man should be in earnest, it is his religion, and we respect the rigidness of our Puritan ancestors more than we do the laxity of their descendants. The man who is in earnest, and who really believes his religion to be the only true religion, must needs be regarded as bigoted and intolerant by all who differ from him. The Catholic is no bigot, is never uncharitable, but he is and must be, in all that concerns religion, exclusive. The Church is necessarily exclusive and intolerant, in the sense in which truth and duty are exclusive and intolerant, and they are wanting in their fidelity to her who maintain the contrary. There can be no giving and taking, no communion, no fellowship, no meeting half-way, between her and those without. As we have said, she will be all or nothing. If she is not what she professes to be, if she can have any fellowship with external communions, she deserves to be nothing, has no right to be at all; but if, as every Catholic believes, she is what she professes to be, she has the right to be all, and whatever is opposed to her the faithful must hold to be of sin and iniquity, and to be resisted, if need be, even unto death.

But if you take that ground, you will be called a bigot, and accused of a want of charity and liberality. *Quid inde?* Suppose it is so, is that a thing for which a man should break his neck? In this country every man has the legal right to choose and observe his own religion, so long as he respects the equal right of others. This right we claim for ourselves, and, as far as in our power, vindicate for all; but here we stop. We cannot consent to maintain, in deference to Voltaire and his followers, that a man has a divine and natural right to be of any religion he pleases. Before the divine and natural law no man has the right to be of a false religion; and when the case is transferred from the exterior court to the interior, no man has the right to be of any religion but the Catholic, and no one can be acceptable to God or gain heaven, unless he is a true, firm, sincere, conscientious Roman Catholic. You say this is narrow-minded bigotry; we say it is truth and consistency, and what every Catholic must say, and he who is afraid to say it has no business to call himself a Catholic. But you who are outside may call it what you please. We have no wish to be gratuitously offensive to you, but we do not look to you for instructions. You

are not our masters, nor are we troubled by what you say of us, — unless you speak in our praise. Then, indeed, we might ask with the Psalmist, "O Lord, what sin hath thy servant committed, that the wicked praise him?" We Catholics look to our Holy Mother for approbation, and if we secure her maternal smile and blessing, we care not, for our sakes, however much we may for yours, what you may think of us. It would be much more to the purpose for you to ask what you ought to think of yourselves.

Every Catholic, from the fact that he is a Catholic, has the world and the devil for his enemies. This is one of the necessities of his profession of faith. He cannot escape it, without deserting his post, and proving a traitor to his Master. If he be not a base coward, he will gird on his armour, and go forth to the battle in the Lord. The enemy is always at hand, and must be ferreted out and withstood, let him come in what lurking disguise he may. He comes to-day as a pretended friend, bearing the honorable name of Liberality, and dressed in the shining robes of Charity; but he is none the less, but all the more, dangerous for that. The pretended friendship is a snare; the boasted liberality is a lure. Be on your guard. If you listen to the voice of the siren, and drink of the proffered chalice, like the companions of Ulysses, you will be transformed into swine, and wallow in the mire. We cannot shake hands with the spirit of the age without contracting a mortal disease. We must resist it, or die. In vain would we sound a parley with the devil, and seek to coax or bribe him to leave us to serve in peace Him whom he hates. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you. There is no other way of safety; and the sooner we understand this, accept it, and beg of God to give us grace to conform to it, the better will it be for us and also for the enemies of the Church.

It is always the sign of an unhealthy state of things, when the faithful contemplate their faith as something to which those without are to be conciliated, rather than as the principle of a holy life in themselves. The conciliation and conversion of heretics is, no doubt, a great and important work; but there is a work greater and more important still, — namely, the edification of the faithful, and the salvation of our own souls. We are, indeed, to do good to all men as we have opportunity, but especially to the household of faith. Charity begins at home; and he who provides not for his own household has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel. Our faith and

religion need to be studied and presented mainly for the edification and perfection of the faithful themselves ; and when we seek so to study and present them, we shall not ask, how little will answer. We shall inquire, not for the minimum, but for the maximum. We want for ourselves our religion in all its fulness, in all its life and vigor, with all its outspreading branches and thick foliage, in all the rich, luxuriant growth of nature, — not trimmed and pruned to suit the taste of a cold, rationalistic, half-skeptical, timid, and fastidious taste. We want it as unlike heresy as it can be. What sectarians most hate we most love ; what they find most offensive we find most edifying ; the more they hate, the more we love ; and even things indifferent in themselves become dear to us as life, the moment they oppose them. It is in this spirit books should be written, and would be, if written by Catholics for Catholics. The books we are censuring are not written in this spirit, and therefore are not books adapted to our edification.

The conversion of heretics is desirable, we grant ; but for their sakes, not for ours. We seek their conversion from charity, not interest. We receive nothing from them, but they receive an infinite benefit. The gain is all on their side. They have nothing to give us. We covet not their silver or their gold, their fashion or their respectability. The Church looks not to the rank or standing of her members. She can borrow no respectability from the highest rank, but the highest can receive new dignity and lustre from her. We admit that the great majority of the faithful, with us, belong to the poorer and humbler classes, and we thank God that it is so. The poor have souls as precious as the souls of the rich. They, in all ages, have been the jewels of the Church, and the sounder part of the faithful. They build our churches, support our clergy, and endow our orphan asylums and charitable institutions. It is the widow's mite that makes the treasury of the Church overflow. Sad indeed would have been the condition of the Catholic Church in this country, if she had been compelled to depend, for her temporal goods, on the contributions of rich and fashionable Catholics. The poor are God's chosen people, and above all, with us, the poor Irish. We honor the German emigrant ; he has done well, for he came richer in faith than in gold ; but the poor Irish laborers and servant-girls have been, with us, the most liberal benefactors of the Church. They came, and on landing looked round and asked, Where is the

Church ? Honest souls ! in their simple faith and tender piety, they could not understand how there could be any living without the Church. They could work hard, shelter themselves in a poor shanty, lodge on the bare ground, and want food for the body ; but they could not live without the Church. They must have the Bread of Life, and some one to break it for them ; and where they went, churches arose, surmounted by the emblem of man's salvation, the sacred priest followed, the Holy Sacrifice was offered, God was praised, and the poor exiles found a home. Would we exchange these for rich and fashionable heretics ? Or shall we think it is to be regretted that God sent us these to be our laity, instead of the rich and noble, the learned and the distinguished ? O, no ! Our good Father chose well for us ; and who knows how much we, who have the happiness of being converted, owe to the prayers of the poor servant-girls we have had in our employment ? Nothing is more silly or disgusting than this fawning around the rich and fashionable, than this hankering after wealth and patronage, which our Catholic novels exhibit. Such things make one ashamed and blush for the folly and forgetfulness of some of his brethren.

We presume, in these remarks, we shall be found treading on some worthy people's corns or gouty toes, and that we shall be thought by many bigoted and severe, as well as unfair and unjust to our incipient literature. All we can say is, that we stand here on our own natal soil, a free man, by divine grace a Catholic, and we do not know how to speak in a servile or an apologetic tone. Before authority we count it an honor to be permitted to bend the knee and the will ; but before heresy, error, evil tendencies, by whomsoever abetted, we stand erect, and, with God's blessing, will stand erect, as becomes one who has been made a free citizen of the commonwealth of God. If we speak at all, we must, as a Catholic, speak as we have been taught. If we err, let authority rebuke us, and we are submissive, silent ; but we shall not rebuke ourselves for aiming to show the necessity there is that all Catholic writers should adopt a free, pure, bold, lofty, and uncompromising Catholic tone, and speak out from good, warm, honest, *Catholic* hearts, without the least conceivable fear of heretics, or of their father, the devil, to make them falter and stammer in the utterance of God's truth.

As a critic, we aim to be fair, candid, and just, but are by

no means infallible, and appeal lies from us to the public. The aggrieved party can appeal, and in most cases, we doubt not, the appeal will be sustained ; for we are far from pretending to be guided by popular taste or public opinion in forming and expressing our judgments. The authors of the publications in question are, for the most part, entirely unknown to us, and we have and can have no personal motive for treating them unfairly or unkindly. We take a deep interest in our literature, and wish to see it flourish, but they must pardon us if we tell them that we prefer Catholicity to its literature. Faith and sanctity are necessaries of life, but literature is not. A bad literature is worse than none ; and any literature which is not adapted to our wants, which turns our minds away from what should fix attention, and aids and encourages tendencies already too strong, in our judgment, is bad. If in this we err, or if we have misconceived the spirit of our present popular literature, it has been from ignorance or weakness, not from malice.

We have spoken plainly and strongly, for it is always better to crush an evil in the bud than when it is full blown, and because we regard our popular writers as possessing learning, talents, genius enough to give us far better works than they do, and they deserve something of a castigation for not doing so. They give us works which spring from the exceptionable tendencies we have pointed out, and which, instead of checking, can hardly fail to exaggerate them. We tell them this, not to discourage them, but to do what in us lies to direct their attention to the dangers to which the faithful are exposed, and to urge them, by the most powerful motives of our religion, to adapt their works to our actual and most pressing wants. We respect their motives and applaud their zeal, but we pray them to look deeper, to take a wider survey of our actual condition, and consider more attentively the peculiar temptations and seductions we are called upon to resist ; and to write books which will tend to edify us, to turn our attention, not outward, where all is hostile, but inward, where all should be, and may be, unremitted effort after Christian perfection. If they would do this, and give us works modelled, to some extent, after the charming tales of Canon Schmid, — works which unfold the internal richness and beauty of religion, which show how it blends in with all our daily duties and household affections, sweetening our cares, sustaining us in our trials, consoling us in our sorrows, imparting depth and tenderness to chaste love, new charms to the innocence and sprightliness of childhood,

strength and dignity to the prime of life, peace and gravity to old age, they would furnish a far more attractive series of publications, secure to themselves a far wider circle of readers, and exert an infinitely more healthful influence, both on Catholics themselves, and on those who unhappily are aliens from the kingdom of God.

Unquestionably, such works would require labor and study, prayer and mortification, abstraction from worldly thoughts and cares, subdued passions, and complete self-annihilation. But we will not suppose that this would be an objection. It should rather be an argument in their favor, and serve to stimulate ambition. The ambition to do what is beautiful, great, noble, and difficult, for the love of God and our neighbour, is praiseworthy, and the only ambition that is not mean and belittling. A blessing would attend the preparation of such works. The author would live in a pure and serene atmosphere, and commune with the sweet and gentle, the strong and the heroic. He would dwell in the presence of God, and sustain and nourish his life with Him who gave his own life to be ours. He would become a better man; his vision would be purged, his heart expanded, and his soul filled with holy unction; and from his pen would flow words of sweetness and power; he would make to himself a throne in the hearts of the young and the old, the joyful and the sorrowful; the poor and the bereaved would bless him, the saints would claim him as their brother, and God would embrace him as his son. His work would be holy; his reward a crown of life. O, who would not, if duty permitted, leave the arid and barren field of mere dialectics, the tumultuous sea of controversy, and seek out some quiet retreat, where bloom the perennial flowers of piety and love, and where, if he spoke at all, he would speak from the heart to the heart of the rich graces and consolations our good Father, through our sweet Mother, never tires in bestowing on those who love him, and seek no love but his?

When we look upon the multitude of our youth, growing up in a land so hostile to their faith, amidst temptations and seductions so numerous and so powerful, and reflect how hard it is, even for those who are far advanced in Christian perfection, to maintain their ground, we feel that every generous heart should beat for them, and every lover of God and of his neighbour should rush to their aid and rescue. It is frightful to think how many of those around us, who have never known the true Church, precious souls, for whom God has died, must

finally be lost ; but it is far more frightful, that not these only, but thousands of our own dear children, regenerated in Holy Baptism, anointed with the Holy Chrism, soldiers enlisted in the army of King Jesus, are to fall away, become deserters, traitors, and, from heirs of heaven, heirs of eternal fire. These claim our thoughts, our prayers, and our labors. For the love of Jesus, dear friends, turn your minds and affections towards these exposed youth, and speak, if you can, a word that shall touch their yet susceptible hearts, that shall quicken their love for religion, and make them feel how noble, how honorable, it is to be a Catholic, especially in a land where the Cross is derided, where holy things are hourly profaned, and men glory in denying the Lord that bought them. Open to them the grandeur and sublimity of our holy religion, and make their cheeks redden that they ever were so cowardly as to be ashamed of it. Make them feel, by your own quiet, assured manner, by your own inward fulness and joy, that you have in it all you ask for, and that you do not need to coax all the world to go with you, in order to save you from regretting the choice you have made. Show that you love your brethren, that you honor your Catholic friends, even the humblest, and see, in the poorest and most illiterate servant-girl, a nobility that infinitely surpasses that of the proudest of earth's kings or potentates ; for the humblest Catholic has that which makes him the son of the King of kings, and heir of an immortal crown.

Our youth find their religion rejected and derided by those they see, when they look forth into the world, honored, courted, and flattered, even by Catholics themselves. Wealth, fashion, honors, distinction, place, power, are in the hands of the enemies of the Church, and they feel that their religion is an obstacle to their rising in the world, a bar to their worldly ambition, and they are tempted to wear it loosely, or to throw it off altogether, — unless, perchance, to call it in, if they have an opportunity, to bury them. They are ashamed of it, because they imagine it detracts from their respectability ; and it is not uncommon to hear even those who are not, as yet, quite lost, apologizing for it, and alleging as their excuse, that their parents were Catholics, and brought them up to go to Mass. This, in a country like ours, where there are no fixed ranks, where nobody is contented to serve God and save his soul in the state of life in which he was born, and where there is a universal strife of every body to rise to the top of the social

ladder, makes the condition of our Catholic youth one full of peril.

It is of no use to undertake to show them, in books, that we have Catholics able to grace any walk in life, or to add lustre to the most brilliant and fashionable assemblies, and that we are daily making converts from the very *élite* of Protestant society. This is only to approve their false ambition, and to inflame it yet more. Moreover, these marvellous Catholics, and still more marvellous converts, — so common in books, — are somewhat rare in every-day society ; they bear but a small proportion to the whole number of the faithful ; the worldly advantages remain as ever on the side of the enemies of the Church, and those Catholics who flatter themselves that they are somebody are very apt to show that they prefer a rich and distinguished heretic, as a friend and companion, to the poor but devout Catholic. Our authors should study to correct this, and seek to avert the evil by drying up its source. They must repudiate the silly and absurd notion, that the heretical world around us is the fountain of honor, that it is an honor to a Catholic for rich and influential heretics to take notice of him, or that it is better to frequent the gay saloons and fashionable assemblies of those who are the enemies of God, the deriders of his Immaculate Spouse, than it is to live in the modest and humble society of the faithful. What is the proudest heretic in the land, in comparison with the poorest and most illiterate Irish laborer or servant-girl ? Who would not rather be poor and outcast, despised and trampled on, with the hope of heaven before him, than to have all this world's goods, and hell in the world to come ? And who that has a Catholic heart does not find more that is congenial to his taste and feelings, more of all those qualities which adorn human nature, and which make one a desirable friend and companion, in the humblest but sincere Catholic, than in your most elevated, high-bred, accomplished, and fascinating heretic ? Believers are the true nobility, whatever their social position or worldly possessions. They are God's nobility, and will surround his throne, and live in his immediate presence ; while others, whom a vain and foolish world runs after, admires, adulates, all but adores, will be cast down to hell, to writhe in eternal agony with devils, and all that is foul, and filthy, and hateful, and disgusting, — gnashing their teeth, and blaspheming, as they behold from afar the glory and beatitude of those they had despised when living. This thought should stamp itself on the pages of our literature.

Our writers should aim to show not tenderness only to the poor, but true Christian HONOR, as our religion commands; they must acknowledge no high life, where God is not loved and served; rise above the vain follies and frivolities of the world; and, avoiding the levelling absurdities of the day, all of which spring from a worldly pride, recognize the dignity and worth of every soul, the true equality of all souls before God, and then they will breathe a Catholic spirit, and, to the extent of their influence, create a Catholic atmosphere around our youth, — a Catholic public sentiment to which they may defer without meanness or danger of corruption.

Our authors would do us a service, if they would stamp with disgrace that silly notion which some, who regard themselves as the better sort among Catholics, are not ashamed to express, — that our condition would be much pleasanter, and the cause of Catholicity more flourishing in this country, if we had a larger number of wealthy and distinguished Catholics. We have heard this said, and coupled even with a regret that so large a portion of the Catholic population is made up of poor foreigners. Converts from the old Puritan stock, like ourselves, are very apt, when first coming into the Church, to take up without reflection a notion of this sort. God forgive them! Whom did our Lord choose for his intimate friends and for his apostles? Were they not poor fishermen and contemned publicans? Who composed the first Christian congregations in the cities of the Gentiles? Were they not poor dispersed Hellenistic Jews, the poor Irish of their day, — almost an abomination to their proud and idolatrous heathen neighbours, — and after those, chiefly the slaves and the lowest class of the people? Did the Apostles complain of this? Nay, they gloried in it. Do our honorable bishops and priests complain of the rank and standing of their flocks? By no means, for they know that God seeth not as man seeth. What matters it where a man was born? Let us who are native-born remember that so large a portion of our brethren were born elsewhere only to remember the faith and virtues they brought with them, and to engage in a holy strife with them which shall outdo the other in humility, and works of charity and mercy. The Church is the Catholic's country, and his home is where God is offered for the living and the dead, and abides with his people.

Finally, we beg our authors to study to strengthen the sentiment and draw closer the bonds of brotherhood among our widely scattered population, and to induce us to feel and speak

of ourselves as a CATHOLIC COMMUNITY. We are such, if we would but own it. We are in the world, but not of it; and, saving that charity which knows no geographical boundaries, or distinctions of race or creed, we should seek, as far as possible, to concentre our interests and affections, our hopes and aspirations, our joys and our sorrows, within our own cherished Catholic community. Taking care, in relation to those without, to discharge all our duties as good citizens, kind neighbours, and faithful servants, we should regard ourselves as forming a commonwealth of our own, in which we live according to our own laws and usages. We are such a commonwealth, and the closer we draw its bonds, the better for us, the better for all. This accepted, we should have a public and a public opinion of our own, and our children would find a home at home, and soon come to restrict their aspirations to such rewards and honors as are in the gift of their own, their *Catholic* countrymen.

The world around us, no doubt, at first will rage or sneer at this; but no matter. Take care to give them no just cause of complaint, and then heed them not. We are and must be, in some sort, a people apart, with our own aims, hopes, duties, and affections. Let us be so; let us love and honor the meanest of our brethren beyond the most distinguished among the heretics; cherish each other, aid and assist, protect and defend, each other as our religion commands; and soon the world without will look on in admiration. Seeing how closely we are knit together in the bonds of unity, and how we love one another, they will knock at our door for admission, and, with tears and entreaties, beg to be naturalized in our republic, to live under our laws, and to share the freedom, peace, and prosperity of our institutions.

Let all who undertake to write for us look to this desirable result, and write with a deep and tender love, not only for Catholicity, but for Catholics, and because they are Catholics; and their works will have a salutary influence in checking the evils to which we are exposed. They will then write as Catholics for Catholics; and our youth, if they read, will see and feel that not the clergy only, but all good Catholics, take an interest in them, and are willing to cast their lot in with theirs. The attention of the faithful will be turned more and more in upon themselves, and the work of our own conversion and progress will be accelerated; and just in proportion as we ourselves are what we should be, the work of conversion will

go on without. Let the faithful only be good Catholics, obedient to their dear Mother, and attentive to their duties, and they will merit blessings not only for themselves, but for others. God will then hear and answer their prayers for the conversion of their Protestant friends; and before they are aware of it, they will find the whole country is Catholic, that throughout its whole extent the Cross is planted, the choral chant is heard, the "clean sacrifice" daily offered, and the whole population, as it were, drawing near in faith and humility to receive the Bread of Life.

This glorious consummation, under God and the intercession of his Holy Mother, is undoubtedly to be brought about chiefly by the ministry of those whom the Holy Ghost has placed over us to govern and to feed us; but we who are laymen, and write for the public, may, working in submission to them, with warm hearts, and fervent zeal, and strong faith, and ardent charity, in our humble degree contribute something towards it, — at least, we can pray for it, strive for it, and avoid doing any thing to retard it. But we almost feel that in what we have said we have exceeded the province of the layman, especially one who but yesterday was himself in the ranks of the enemies of the Church, and who is not worthy of the least consideration among the faithful; but if so, may God and our brethren forgive us.

---

ART. V. — *Sanctissimi Domini nostri Pii Divina Providentia Papæ IX. Epistola Encyclica ad omnes Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos, et Episcopos.* Romæ. Typis Rev. Cam. Apost. apud Salvivecios. 1846.

WE copy below the *Encyclical Letter* of our Holy Father, Pope Pius IX. We have no room for comments, and should not offer any if we had. In it God speaks to us by his Vicegerent on earth, and it is ours to listen, believe, and obey. We cannot, however, forbear remarking, that whoever would wish to understand what are the precise evils of the day, against which the Church and all the faithful are to struggle, will find them all here clearly enumerated and distinctly characterized. It leaves us at no loss as to what are the dangerous tendencies we are to struggle against, or under what forms and disguises the Enemy of souls now makes his appearance to seduce us from our love and fidelity to the Immaculate Spouse of

God. Truly does St. Peter continue to watch over the flock, and to feed the sheep and the lambs of his Master.

## PIVS PP. IX.

*Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.*

Qui pluribus jam abhinc annis una Vobiscum, Venerabiles Fratres, episcopale munus plenum laboris, plenum sollicitudinis pro viribus obire, ac Dominici gregis partem curæ Nostræ commissam pascere nitebamur in montibus Israel, in rivis et pascuis uberrimis, ecce ob mortem clarissimi Prædecessoris Nostri Gregorii XVI., cujus certe memoriam, atque illustria et gloriosa facta aureis notis inscripta in Ecclesiæ fastis semper admirabitur posteritas, præter omnem opinionem cogitationemque Nostram, arcano divinæ Providentiæ consilio, ad Summum Pontificatum, non sine maxima animi Nostri perturbatione ac trepidatione, evecti fuimus. Etenim si semper grave admodum et periculosum Apostolici ministerii onus merito est habitum atque habendum, hisce quidem difficillimis christianæ reipublicæ temporibus vel maxime formidandum. Itaque infirmitatis Nostræ probe conscii, et gravissima supremi Apostolatus officia, in tanta præsertim rerum vicissitudine, considerantes, tristitiæ et lacrimis Nos plane tradidissemus, nisi omnem spem poneremus in Deo salutari Nostro, qui numquam derelinquit sperantes in Eo, quique, ut potentiæ suæ virtutem ostendat, ad suam regendam Ecclesiam infirmiora identidem adhibet, quo magis magisque omnes cognoscant Deum ipsum esse, qui Ecclesiam admirabili sua providentia gubernat atque tuetur. Illa etiam consolatio Nos vehementer sustentat, quod in animarum salute procuranda Vos socios et adjutores habeamus, Venerabiles Fratres, qui in sollicitudinis Nostræ partem vocati, omni cura et studio ministerium vestrum implere, ac bonum certamen certare contenditis. Hinc ubi primum in sublimi hac Principis Apostolorum Cathedra, licet immerentes, collocati in persona Beati Petri gravissimum munus ab ipso æterno Pastorum Principe divinitus tributum accepimus pascendi ac regendi non solum agnos, universum scilicet Christianum populum, verum etiam oves, hoc est Antistites, nihil certe Nobis potius, nihil optabilius fuit, quam ut intimo caritatis affectu Vos omnes alloqueremur. Quamobrem vix dum ex more institutoque Decessorum Nostrorum in Nostra Lateranensi Basilica Summi Pontificatus possessionem suscepimus, nulla interposita mora has ad Vos Litteras damus, ut eximiam vestram excitemus pietatem, quo majore usque alacritate, vigilantia, contentione custo-

dientes vigilias noctis super gregem curæ vestræ commissum, atque episcopali robore et constantia adversus teterrimum humani generis hostem dimicantes, veluti boni milites Christi Jesu, strenue opponatis murum pro Domo Israel.

Neminem vestrum latet, Venerabiles Fratres, hac nostra deplorenda ætate acerrimum ac formidolosissimum contra catholicam rem universam bellum ab iis hominibus conflari, qui nefaria inter se societate conjuncti, sanam non sustinentes doctrinam, atque a veritate auditum avertentes, omnigena opinionum portenta tenebris eruere, ea que totis viribus exaggerare, atque in vulgus prodere et disseminare contendunt. Horrescimus quidem animo et acerbissimo dolore conficimur, cum omnia errorum monstra, et varias multiplicesque nocendi artes, insidias, machinationes mente recogitamus, quibus hi veritatis et lucis osores, et peritissimi fraudis artifices omne pietatis, justitiæ, honestatis studium in omnium animis restinguere, mores corrumpere, jura quæque divina et humana perturbare, catholicam religionem, civilemque societatem convellere, labefactare, immo, si fieri umquam posset, funditus evertere commoliuntur. Noscitis enim, Venerabiles Fratres, hos infensissimos christiani nominis hostes, cæco quodam insanientis impietatis impetu misere raptos, eo opinandi temeritate progredi, ut inaudita prorsus audacia *aperientes os suum in blasphemias ad Deum** palam publiceque edocere non erubescant, commentitia esse, et hominum inventa sacrosancta nostræ religionis mysteria, catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinam humanæ societatis bono et commodis adversari, ac vel ipsum Christum et Deum ejurare non extimescant. Et quo facilius populis illudant, atque incautos præsertim et imperitos decipiant, et in errores secum abripiant, sibi unis prosperitatis vias notas esse comminiscuntur, sibique philosophorum nomen arrogare non dubitant, perinde quasi philosophia, quæ tota in naturæ veritate investiganda versatur, ea respuere debeat, quæ supremus et clementissimus ipse totius naturæ auctor Deus singulari beneficio et misericordia hominibus manifestare est dignatus, ut veram ipsi felicitatem et salutem assequantur. Hinc præpostero sane et fallacissimo argumentandi genere numquam desinunt humanæ rationis vim, et excellentiam appellare, extollere contra sanctissimam Christi fidem, atque audacissime blaterant, eam humanæ refragari rationi. Quo certe nihil dementius, nihil magis impium, nihil contra ipsam rationem magis repugnans fingi, vel excogitari potest. Et si

* Apocalyp. xiii. 6.

enim fides sit supra rationem, nulla tamen vera dissensio, nullumque dissidium inter ipsas inveniri umquam potest, cum ambæ ab uno eodemque immutabilis æternæque veritatis fonte Deo Optimo Maximo oriantur, atque ita sibi mutuam opem ferant, ut recta ratio fidei veritatem demonstret, tueatur, defendat; fides vero rationem ab omnibus erroribus liberet, eamque divinarum rerum cognitione mirifice illustret, confirmet atque perficiat. Neque minori certe fallacia, Venerabiles Fratres, isti divinæ revelationis inimici humanum progressum summis laudibus efferentes, in catholicam religionem temerario plane, ac sacrilego ausu illum inducere vellent, perinde ac si ipsa religio non Dei, sed hominum opus esset, aut philosophicum aliquod inventum, quod humanis modis perfici queat. In istos tam misere delirantes percommode quidem cadit, quod Tertullianus sui temporis philosophis merito exprobrabat: *Qui Stoïcum, et Platonicum, et Dialecticum Christianismum protulerunt.** Et sane cum sanctissima nostra religio non ab humana ratione fuerit inventa, sed à Deo hominibus clementissime patefacta, tum quisque vel facile intelligit, religionem ipsam ex ejusdem Dei loquentis auctoriate omnem suam vim acquirere, neque ab humana ratione deduci aut perfici umquam posse. Humana quidem ratio, ne in tanti momenti negotio decipiatur et erret, divinæ revelationis factum diligenter inquirat oportet, ut certo sibi constet Deum esse loquutum, ac Eidem, quemadmodum sapientissime docet Apostolus, rationabile obsequium exhibeat.† Quis enim ignorat, vel ignorare potest omnem Deo loquenti fidem esse habendam, nihilque rationi ipsi magis consentaneum esse, quam iis acquiescere firmiterque adhærere, quæ à Deo qui nec falli nec fallere potest, revelata esse constiterit?

Sed quam multa, quam mira, quam splendida præsto sunt argumenta, quibus humana ratio luculentissime evinci omnino debet, divinam esse Christi religionem, et *omne dogmatum nostrorum principium radicem desuper ex cœlorum Domino accepisse*,‡ ac propterea nihil fide nostra certius, nihil securius, nihil sanctius extare, et quod firmioribus innitatur principiis. Hæc silicet fides, vitæ magistra, salutis index, vitiorum omnium expultrix, ac virtutum fecunda parens et altrix, divini sui auctoris et consummatoris Christi Jesu nativitate, vita, morte, resurrectione, sapientia, prodigiis, vaticinationibus confirmata,

---

* Tertull. de Præscript., cap. VIII.

† Ad Rom. xiii. 1.

‡ S. Joan. Chrysost. Homil. I. in Isai.

supernæ doctrinæ luce undique refulgens, ac cælestium divitiarum dilata thesauris, tot Prophetarum prædictionibus, tot miraculorum splendore, tot Martyrum constantia, tot Sanctorum gloria, vel maxime clara et insignis, salutares proferens Christi leges, ac majores in dies ex crudelissimis ipsis persecutionibus vires acquirens, universum orbem terra marique, a solis ortu usque ad occasum, uno Crucis vexillo pervasit, atque idolorum profligata fallacia, errorum depulsa caligine, triumphatisque cujusque generis hostibus, omnes populos, gentes, nationes utcumque immanitate barbaras, ac indole, moribus, legibus, institutis diversas divinæ cognitionis lumine illustravit, atque suavissimo ipsius Christi jugo subjecit, annuntians omnibus pacem, annuntians bona. Quæ certe omnia tanto divinæ sapientiæ ac potentiæ fulgore undique collucent, ut cujusque mens et cogitatio vel facile intelligat Christianam fidem Dei opus esse. Itaque humana ratio ex splendidissimis hisce, æque ac firmissimis argumentis clare aperteque cognoscens Deum ejusdem fidei auctorem existere, ulterius progredi nequit, sed quavis difficultate ac dubitatione penitus abjecta atque remota, omne eidem fidei obsequium præbeat oportet, cum pro certo habeat a Deo traditum esse quidquid fides ipsa hominibus credendum et agendum proponit.

Atque hinc plane apparet in quanto errore illi etiam versentur, qui ratione abutentes, ac Dei eloquia tamquam humanum opus existimantes, proprio arbitrio illa explicare, interpretari temere audent, cum Deus ipse vivam constituerit auctoritatem, quæ verum legitimumque cælestis suæ revelationis sensum doceret, constabiliret, omnesque controversias in rebus fidei et morum *infallibili* judicio dirimeret, ne fideles circumferantur omni vento doctrinæ in nequitia hominum ad circumventionem erroris. Quæ quidem viva et *infallibilis* auctoritas in ea tantum viget Ecclesia, quæ a Christo Domino supra Petrum totius Ecclesiæ Caput, Principem et Pastorem, cujus fidem numquam defecturam promisit, ædificata, suos legitimos semper habet Pontifices sine intermissione ab ipso Petro ducentes originem, in ejus Cathedra collocatos, et ejusdem etiam doctrinæ, dignitatis, honoris ac potestatis hæredes et vindices. Et quoniam ubi Petrus ibi Ecclesia,* ac Petrus per Romanum Pontificem loquitur,† et semper in suis successoribus vivit, et judicium exercet,‡ ac præstat quærentibus fidei veritatem,§ iccirco di-

* S. Ambros. in Psal. 40.
† Concil. Chalced. Act. 2.
‡ Synod. Ephes. Act. 3.
§ S. Petr. Chrysol. Epist., ad Eutich.

vina eloquia eo plane sensu sunt accipienda, quem tenuit ac tenet hæc Romana Beatissimi Petri Cathedra, quæ omnium Ecclesiarum mater et magistra * fidem a Christo Domino traditam integram inviolatamque semper servavit, eamque fideles edocuit, omnibus ostendens salutis semitam, et incorruptæ veritatis doctrinam. Hæc siquidem principalis Ecclesia, unde unitas Sacerdotalis exorta, † hæc pietatis metropolis, in qua est integra christianæ religionis ac perfecta soliditas, ‡ in qua semper Apostolicæ Cathedræ viguit Principatus, § ad quam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est qui sunt undique fideles, ‖ cum qua quicumque non colligit, spargit.¶ Nos igitur, qui inscrutabili Dei judicio in hac veritatis Cathedra collocati sumus, egregiam vestram pietatem vehementer in Domino excitamus, Venerabiles Fratres, ut omni sollicitudine et studio fideles curæ vestræ concreditos assidue monere, exhortari connitamini, ut hisce principiis firmiter adhærentes, numquam se ab iis decipi, et in errorem induci patiantur, qui abominabiles facti in studiis suis humani progressus obtentu fidem destruere, eamque rationi impie subjicere ac Dei eloquia invertere contendunt, summamque Deo ipsi injuriam inferre non reformidant, qui cælesti sua religione hominum bono atque saluti clementissime consulere est dignatus.

Jam vero probe noscitis, Venerabiles Fratres, alia errorum monstra et fraudes, quibus hujus sæculi filii catholicam religionem, et divinam Ecclesiæ auctoritatem, ejusque leges acerrime oppugnare, et tum sacræ tum civilis potestatis jura conculcare conantur. Huc spectant nefariæ molitiones contra hanc Romanam Beatissimi Petri Cathedram, in qua Christus posuit inexpugnabile Ecclesiæ suæ fundamentum. Huc clandestinæ illæ sectæ e tenebris ad rei tum sacræ tum publicæ exitium et vastitatem emersæ, atque a Romanis Pontificibus Decessoribus Nostris iterato anathemate damnatæ suis Apostolicis Literis,** quas nos Apostolicæ Nostræ potestatis plenitudine confirma-

---

* Concil. Trid., Sess. VII. de Baptis.

† S. Cyprian. Epist. 55, ad Cornel. Pontif.

‡ Litter. Synod. Joann. Constantinop. ad Hormisd. Pontif. et Sozom. Histor. Lib. 3, cap. 8.

§ S. August. Epist. 162.

‖ S. Irenæus, Lib. 3, Contra Hæreses. cap. 3.

¶ S. Hieronym. Epist. ad Damas. Pontif.

** Clemens, XII. Const. *In eminenti*, Bened. XIV. Constit. *Providas*, Pius VII., *Ecclesiam a Jesu Christo*, Leo XII. Const. *Quo graviora.*

mus, et diligentissime servari mandamus. Hoc volunt vaferrimæ Biblicæ societates, quæ veterem hæreticorum artem renovantes, divinarum Scripturarum libros contra sanctissimas Ecclesiæ regulas vulgaribus quibusque linguis translatos, ac perversis sæpe explicationibus interpretatos, maximo exemplarium numero, ingentique expensa omnibus cujusque generis hominibus etiam rudioribus gratuito impertiri, obtrudere non cessant, ut divina traditione, Patrum doctrina, et catholicæ Ecclesiæ auctoritate rejecta, omnes eloquia Domini privato suo judicio interpretentur, eorumque sensum pervertant, atque ita in maximos elabantur errores. Quas societates suorum Decessorum exempla æmulans recol. mem. Gregorius XVI., in cujus locum meritis licet imparibus suffecti sumus, suis Apostolicis Litteris reprobavit,* et Nos pariter damnatas esse volumus. Huc spectat horrendum, ac vel ipsi naturali rationis lumini maxime repugnans de cujuslibet religionis indifferentia systema, quo isti veteratores, omni virtutis et vitii, veritatis et erroris, honestatis et turpitudinis sublato discrimine, homines in cujusvis religionis cultu æternam salutem assequi posse comminiscuntur, perinde ac si ulla umquam esse posset participatio justitiæ cum iniquitate, aut societas luci ad tenebras, et conventio Christi ad Belial. Huc spectat fœdissima contra sacrum clericorum cælibatum conspiratio, quæ a nonnullis etiam, proh dolor ! ecclesiasticis viris fovetur, qui propriæ dignitatis misere obliti, se voluptatum blanditiis et illecebris vinci et deliniri patiuntur ; huc perversa in philosophicis præsertim disciplinis docendi ratio, quæ improvidam juventutem miserandum in modum decipit, corrumpit, eique fel draconis in calice Babylonis propinat ; huc infanda, ac vel ipsi naturali juri maxime adversa de *Communismo*, uti vocant, doctrina, qua semel admissa, omnium jura, res, proprietates, ac vel ipsa humana societas funditus everterentur ; huc tenebricosissimæ eorum insidiæ, qui in vestitu ovium, cum intus sint lupi rapaces, mentita ac fraudulenta purioris pietatis, et severioris virtutis, ac disciplinæ specie humiliter irrepunt, blande capiunt, molliter ligant, latenter occidunt, hominesque ab omni religionis cultu absterrent, et Dominicas oves mactant atque discerpunt. Huc denique, ut cetera, quæ Vobis apprime nota ac perspecta sunt, omittamus, teterrima tot undique volantium, et peccare docentium voluminum ac libellorum contagio, qui apte compositi, ac fallaciæ et artificii pleni, im-

* Gregor. XVI. In Litteris Encyclicis ad omnes Episcopos, quarum initium *Inter præcipuas machinationes.*

manibusque sumptibus per omnia loca in christianæ plebis interitum dissipati, pestiferas doctrinas ubique disseminant, incautorum potissimum mentes animosque depravant, et maxima religioni inferunt detrimenta. Ex hac undique serpentium errorum colluvie, atque effrenata cogitandi, loquendi, scribendique licentia mores in deterius prolapsi, sanctissima Christi spreta religio, divini cultus improbata majestas, hujus Apostolicæ Sedis divexata potestas, Ecclesiæ oppugnata atque in turpem servitutem redacta auctoritas, Episcoporum jura conculcata, matrimonii sanctitas violata, cujusque potestatis regimen labefactatum, ac tot alia tum christianæ, tum civilis reipublicæ damna, quæ communibus lacrimis una Vobiscum flere cogimur, Venerabiles Fratres.

In tanta igitur religionis, rerum ac temporum vicissitudine de Universi Dominici gregis salute Nobis divinitus commissa vehementer solliciti, pro Apostolici Nostri ministerii officio nihil certe inausum, nihilque intentatum relinquemus, quo cunctæ Christianæ familiæ bono totis viribus consulamus. Verum præclaram quoque vestram pietatem, virtutem, prudentiam summopere in Domino excitamus, Venerabiles Fratres, ut cælesti ope freti una Nobiscum Dei, ejusque Sanctæ Ecclesiæ causam, pro loco quem tenetis, pro dignitate qua insigniti estis, impavide defendatis. Vobis acriter pugnandum esse intelligitis, cum minime ignoretis, quibus quantisque intemerata Christi Jesu Sponsa vulneribus afficiatur, quantoque acerrimorum hostium impetu divexetur. Atque in primis optime noscitis, vestri muneris esse catholicam fidem episcopali robore tueri, defendere, ac summa cura vigilare, ut grex Vobis commissus in ea stabilis et immotus persistat, *quam nisi quisque integram, inviolatamque servaverit absque dubio in æternum peribit.** In hanc igitur fidem tuendam atque servandam pro pastorali vestra sollicitudine diligenter incumbite, neque umquam desinite omnes in ea instruere, confirmare nutantes, contradicentes arguere, infirmos in fide corroborare, nihil umquam omnino dissimulantes ac ferentes, quod ejusdem fidei puritatem vel minimum violare posse videatur. Neque minori animi firmitate in omnibus fovete unionem cum Catholica Ecclesia, extra quam nulla est salus, et obedientiam erga hanc Petri Cathedram, cui tamquam firmissimo fundamento tota sanctissimæ nostræ religionis moles innititur. Pari vero constantia sanctissimas Ecclesiæ leges custodiendas curate, quibus profecto virtus, re-

* Ex Symbolo *Quicumque*.

ligio, pietas summopere vigent et florent. Cum autem *magna sit pietas prodere latebras impiorum et ipsum in eis, cui serviunt, diabolum debellare,** illud obsecrantes monemus, ut omni ope et opera multiformes inimicorum hominum insidias, fallacias, errores, fraudes, machinationes fideli populo detegere, eumque a pestiferis libris diligenter avertere atque assidue exhortari velitis, ut impiorum sectas et societates fugiens, tamquam a facie colubri, ea omnia studiosissime devitet, quæ fidei, religionis, morumque integritati adversantur. Qua de re numquam omnino sit, ut, cessetis prædicare Evangelium, quo christiana plebs magis in dies sanctissimis christianæ legis præceptionibus erudita crescat in scientia Dei, declinet a malo et faciat bonum, atque ambulet in viis Domini. Et quoniam nostis Vos pro Christo legatione fungi, qui se mitem et humilem corde est professus, quique non venit vocare justos, sed peccatores, relinquens nobis exemplum ut sequamur vestigia ejus ; quos in mandatis Domini delinquentes, atque a veritatis et justitiæ semita aberrantes inveneritis, haud omittite eos in spiritu lenitatis et mansuetudinis paternis monitis et consiliis corripere atque arguere, obsecrare, increpare in omni bonitate, patientia et doctrina, cum *sæpe plus erga corrigendos agat benevolentia, quam austeritas, plus exhortatio, quam comminatio, plus caritas, quam potestas.* † Illud etiam totis viribus præstare contendite, Venerabiles Fratres, ut fideles caritatem sectentur, pacem inquirant, et quæ caritatis et pacis sunt sedulo exequantur, quo cunctis dissentionibus, inimicitiis, æmulationibus, simultatibus penitus extinctis, omnes se mutua caritate diligant, atque in eodem sensu, in eadem sententia perfecti sint, et idem unanimes sentiant, idem dicant, idem sapiant in Christo Jesu Domino Nostro. Debitam erga Principes et potestates obedientiam ac subjectionem christiano populo inculcare satagite, edocentes juxta Apostoli monitum ‡ non esse potestatem nisi a Deo, eosque Dei ordinationi resistere, adeoque sibi damnationem acquirere, qui potestati resistunt, atque iccirco præceptum potestati ipsi obediendi a nemine umquam citra piaculum posse violari, nisi forte aliquid imperetur, quod Dei et Ecclesiæ legibus adversetur.

Verum cum *nihil sit, quod alios magis ad pietatem, et Dei cultum assidue instruat, quam eorum vita et exemplum, qui se*

* S. Leo, Serm. VIII., cap. 4.
† Concil. Triden., Sess. XIII., cap. 1, de Reformat.
‡ Ad Roman. xiii. 1, 2.

*divino ministerio dedicarunt*,* et cujusmodi sunt Sacerdotes, ejusmodi plerumque esse soleat et populus, pro vestra singulari sapientia perspicitis, Venerabiles Fratres, summa cura et studio Vobis esse elaborandum, ut in Clero morum gravitas, vitæ integritas, sanctitas, atque doctrina eluceat, et ecclesiastica disciplina ex Sacrorum Canonum præscripto diligentissime servetur, et ubi collapsa fuerit, in pristinum splendorem restituatur. Quapropter, veluti præclare scitis Vobis summopere cavendum, ne cuipiam, juxta Apostoli præceptum, cito manus imponatis, sed eos tantum sacris initeitis ordinibus, ac sanctis tractandis admoveatis mysteriis, qui accurate exquisiteque explorati, ac virtutum omnium ornatu et sapientiæ laude spectati, vestris diœcesibus usui et ornamento esse possint, atque ab iis omnibus declinantes, quæ Clericis vetita, et attendentes lectioni, exhortationi, doctrinæ *exemplum sint fidelium in verbo, in conversatione, in caritate, in fide, in castitate*,† cunctisque afferant venerationem, et populum ad christianæ religionis institutionem fingant, excitent, atque inflamment. *Melius enim profecto est*, ut sapientissime monet immortalis memoriæ Benedictus XIV., Decessor Noster, *pauciores habere ministros, sed probos, sed idoneos atque utiles, quam plures, qui in ædificationem Corporis Christi, quod est Ecclesia, nequidquam sint valituri.*‡ Neque vero ignoratis, majori diligentia Vobis in illorum præcipue mores, et scientiam esse inquirendum, quibus animarum cura et regimen committitur, ut ipsi tamquam fideles multiformis gratiæ Dei dispensatores plebem sibi concreditam sacramentorum administratione, divini verbi prædicatione ac bonorum operum exemplo continenter pascere, juvare, eamque ad omnia religionis instituta ac documenta informare, atque ad salutis semitam perducere studeant. Intelligitis nimirum Parochis officii sui ignaris, vel negligentibus, continuo et populorum mores prolabi, et christianam laxari disciplinam, et religionis cultum exsolvi atque convelli, ac vitia omnia et corruptelas in Ecclesiam facile invehi. Ne autem Dei sermo, *qui vivus, et efficax, et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti*§ ad animarum salutem est institutus, ministrorum vitio infructuosus evadat, ejusdem divini verbi præconibus inculcare, præcipere numquam desinite, Venerabiles Fratres, ut gravissimum sui mu-

* Concil. Trid., Sess. XXII., cap. 1, de Reform.

† Ad Timoth. iv. 12.

‡ Bened. XIV. in Epist. Encycl. ad omnes Episcopos, cujus initium, *Ubi primum.*

§ Ad Hebr. iv. 12.

neris officium animo reputantes, evangelicum ministerium non in persuasibilibus humanæ sapientiæ verbis, non in profano inanis et ambitiosæ eloquentiæ apparatu et lenocinio, sed in ostentatione spiritus et virtutis religiosissime exerceant, ut recte tractantes verbum veritatis, et non semetipsos, sed Christum Crucifixum prædicantes, sanctissimæ nostræ religionis dogmata, præcepta juxta catholicæ Ecclesiæ et Patrum doctrinam gravi ac splendido orationis genere populis clare aperteque annuncient, peculiaria singulorum officia accurate explicent, omnesque a flagitiis deterreant, ad pietatem inflamment, quo fideles Dei verbo salubriter imbuti atque refecti vitia omnia declinent, virtutes sectentur, atque ita æternas pœnas evadere, et cælestem gloriam consequi valeant. Universos ecclesiasticos viros pro pastorali vestra sollicitudine et prudentia assidue monete, excitate, ut serio cogitantes ministerium, quod acceperunt in Domino, omnes proprii muneris partes diligentissime impleant, domus Dei decorem summopere diligant, atque intimo pietatis sensu sine intermissione instent obsecrationibus et precibus, et Canonicas horas et Ecclesiæ precepto persolvant, quo et divina sibi auxilia ad gravissima officii sui munera obeunda impetrare, et Deum christiano populo placatum ac propitium reddere possint.

Cum autem, Venerabiles Fratres, vestram sapientiam minime fugiat, idoneos Ecclesiæ ministros nonnisi ex optime institutis clericis fieri posse, magnamque vim in recta horum institutione ad reliquum vitæ cursum inesse, pergite omnes episcopalis vestri zeli nervos in id potissimum intendere, ut adolescentes clerici vel a teneris annis tum ad pietatem solidamque virtutem, tum ad litteras severioresque disciplinas, præsertim sacras, rite informentur. Quare vobis nihil antiquius, nihil potius esse debet, quam omni opera, sollertia, industria clericorum Seminaria ex Tridentinorum Patrum præscripto * instituere, si nondum existunt, atque instituta, si opus fuerit, amplificare, eaque optimis moderatoribus et magistris instruere, ac intentissimo studio continenter advigilare, ut inibi juniores clerici in timore Domini, et ecclesiastica disciplina sancte religioseque educentur, et sacris potissimum scientiis juxta catholicam doctrinam ab omni prorsus cujusque erroris periculo alienis, et Ecclesiæ traditionibus, et sanctorum Patrum scriptis, sacrisque cæremoniis, ritibus sedulo ac penitus excolantur, quo habere possitis navos atque industrios operarios, qui ec-

* Concil. Trid., Sess. XXIII., cap. 18, de Reform.

clesiastico spiritu præditi, ac studiis recte instituti valeant in tempore dominicum agrum diligenter excolere, ac strenue prœliari prœlia Domini. Porro cum Vobis compertum sit ad ecclesiastici ordinis dignitatem, et sanctimoniam retinendam et conservandam pium spiritualium exercitiorum institutum vel maxime conducere, pro episcopali vestro zelo tam salutare opus urgere, omnesque in sortem Domini vocatos monere, hortari ne intermittatis, ut sæpe in opportunum aliquem locum iisdem peragendis exercitiis secedant, quo, exterioribus curis sepositis, ac vehementiori studio æternarum divinarumque rerum meditationi vacantes, et contractas de mundano pulvere sordes detergere, et ecclesiasticum spiritum renovare possint, atque expoliantes veterem hominem cum actibus suis, novum induant, qui creatus est in justitia et sanctitate. Neque Vos pigeat si in Cleri institutione et disciplina paulo diutius immorati sumus. Etenim minime ignoratis multos existere, qui errorum varietatem, inconstantiam, mutabilitatemque pertæsi, ac sanctissimam nostram religionem profitendi necessitatem sentientes, ad ipsius religionis doctrinam, præcepta instituta eo facilius, Deo bene juvante, amplectenda colenda adducentur, quo majori Clerum pietatis, integritatis, sapientiæ laude, ac virtutum omnium exemplo et splendore ceteris antecellere conspexerint.

Ceterum, Fratres Carissimi, non dubitamus, quin Vos omnes ardenti erga Deum et homines caritate incensi, summo in Ecclesiam amore inflammati, angelicis pene virtutibus instructi, episcopali fortitudine, prudentia muniti, uno eodemque sanctæ voluntatis desiderio animati, Apostolorum vestigia sectantes, et Christum Jesum Pastorum omnium exemplar, pro quo legatione fungimini, imitantes, quemadmodum decet Episcopos, concordissimis studiis facti forma gregis ex animo, sanctitatis vestræ splendore Clerum populumque fidelem illuminantes, atque induti viscera misericordiæ et condolentes iis qui ignorant at errant, devias ac pereuntes oves evangelici Pastoris exemplo amanter quærere, persequi ac paterno affectu vestris humeris imponere, ad ovile reducere, ac nullis neque curis, neque consiliis, neque laboribus parcere umquam velitis, quo omnia pastoralis muneris officia religiosissime obire, ac omnes dilectas Nobis oves pretiosissimo Christi sanguine redemptas, et curæ vestræ commissas a rapacium luporum rabie, impetu, insidiis defendere, easque ab venenatis pascuis arcere, ad salutaria propellere, et qua opere, qua verbo, qua exemplo ad æternæ salutis portum deducere valeatis. In majori igitur Dei et Ecclesiæ gloria

procuranda viriliter agite, Venerabiles Fratres, et omni alacritate, sollicitudine, vigilantia in hoc simul elaborate, ut omnibus erroribus penitus depulsis, vitiisque radicitus evulsis, fides, religio, pietas, virtus majora in dies ubique incrementa suscipiant, cunctique fideles abjicientes opera tenebrarum, sicut filii lucis ambulent digne Deo per omnia placentes, et in omni opere bono fructificantes. Atque inter maximas angustias, difficultates, pericula, quæ a gravissimo episcopali vestro ministerio hisce præsertim temporibus abesse non possunt, nolite umquam terreri, sed confortamini in Domino, et in potentia virtutis Ejus, *qui nos in congressione nominis sui constitutos desuper spectans, volentes comprobat, adjuvat dimicantes, vincentes coronat.** Cum autem Nobis nihil gratius, nihil jucundius, nihil optabilius quam Vos omnes, quos diligimus in visceribus Christi Jesu, omni affectu, consilio, opera juvare, atque una Vobiscum in Dei gloriam et catholicam fidem tuendam, propagandam toto pectore incumbere, et animas salvas facere, pro quibus vitam ipsam, si opus fuerit, profundere parati sumus, venite, Fratres, obtestamur et obsecramus, venite magno animo, magnaque fiducia ad hanc Beatissimi Apostolorum Principis Sedem, Catholicæ unitatis centrum, atque Episcopatus apicem, unde ipse Episcopatus, ac tota ejusdem nominis auctoritas emersit, venite ad Nos quotiescumque Nostræ, et ejusdem Sedis auctoritatis ope, auxilio, præsidio Vos indigere noveritis.

In eam porro spem erigimur fore, ut Carissimi in Christo Filii Nostri Viri Principes pro eorum pietate et religione in memoriam revocantes *regiam potestatem sibi non solum ad mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiæ præsidium esse collatam*,† et Nos *cum Ecclesiæ causam tum eorum regni agere, et salutis, ut provinciarum suarum quieto jure potiantur*,‡ communibus nostris votis, consiliis, studiis sua ope et auctoritate faveant, atque ipsius Ecclesiæ libertatem incolumitatemque defendant, ut *et Christi dextera eorum defendatur imperium*.§

Quæ omnia ut prospere, feliciterque ex sententia succedant, adeamus cum fiducia, Venerabiles Fratres, ad thronum gratiæ, atque unanimes in humilitate cordis nostri Patrem misericordiarum, et Deum totius consolationis enixis precibus sine intermissione obsecremus, ut per merita Unigeniti Filii sui infirmi-

* S. Cyprian. Epist. 77, ad Nemesianum et ceteros martyres.
† S. Leo, Epist. 156, al. 125, ad Leonem Augustum.
‡ Idem, Epist. 43, al. 36, ad Theodosium Augustum.
§ Idem, ibid.

tatem nostram omnium cælestium charismatum copia cumulare dignetur, atque omnipotenti sua virtute expugnet impugnantes nos, et ubique augeat fidem, pietatem, devotionem, pacem, quo Ecclesia sua sancta, omnibus adversitatibus et erroribus penitus sublatis, optatissima tranquillitate fruatur, ac fiat unum ovile, et unus pastor. Ut autem clementissimus Dominus facilius inclinet aurem suam in preces nostras, et nostris annuat votis, deprecatricem apud Ipsum semper adhibeamus sanctissimam Dei Genitricem Immaculatam Virginem Mariam, quæ nostrum omnium dulcissima mater mediatrix, advocata, et spes fidissima ac maxima fiducia est, cujus patrocinio nihil apud Deum validius, nihil præsentius. Invocemus quoque Apostolorum Principem, cui Christus ipse tradidit claves regni cœlorum, quemque Ecclesiæ suæ petram constituit, adversus quam portæ inferi prævalere numquam poterunt, et Coapostolum ejus Paulum, atque omnes Sanctos cælites, qui jam coronati possident palmam, ut desideratam divinæ propitiationis abundantiam universo christiano populo impetrent.

Denique cælestium omnium munerum auspicem, et potissimæ Nostræ in Vos caritatis testem, accipite Apostolicam Benedictionem, quam ex intimo corde depromptam Vobis ipsis, Venerabiles Fratres, et omnibus Clericis, Laicisque Fidelibus curæ vestræ concreditis amantissime impertimur.

Datum Romæ apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem, die IX. Novembris, Anno MDCCCXLVI., Pontificatus Nostri Anno Primo.

---

ART. VI. — *Poems.* By R. W. EMERSON. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1847. 16mo. pp. 251.

IF we could forget that Almighty God has made us a revelation, and by faith solved for us the problem of man and the universe; and if we could persuade ourselves that we are here with darkness behind us, darkness before us, and darkness all around us, relieved only by the fitful gleam from the reversed torch of reason, at best serving only to confront us, turn we which way we will, with the dread unknown, we should greet these poems with a warm and cordial welcome, and saving the mere mechanism of verse-making, in which they are sometimes defective, assign them the highest rank among our American attempts at poetry. The author is no every-day

man ; indeed, he is one of the most gifted of our countrymen, and is largely endowed with the true poetic temperament and genius. He has a rich and fervid imagination, a refined taste, exquisite sensibility, a strong and acute intellect, and a warm and loving heart. He is earnest and solemn, and, taking his own point of view, a man of high and noble aims. If truth were no essential ingredient of poetry, if the earthly were the celestial, and man were God, and if the highest excellence of song consisted in its being a low and melodious wail, we know not where to look for any thing superior to some of the wonderful productions collected in the volume before us.

But the palm of excellence, even under the relation of art, belongs not to poetry which chants falsehood and evil. The poet is an artist, and the aim of the artist is to realize or embody the beautiful ; but the beautiful is never separable from the true and the good. Truth, goodness, beauty, are only three phases of one and the same thing. God is the True, the Good, the Fair. As the object of the intellect, he is the True ; as the object of the will, the Good ; as the object of the imagination, the passions, and emotions, the Beautiful ; but under whichever phase or aspect we may contemplate him, he is always one and the same infinite, eternal God, indivisible and indistinguishable. In his works it is always the same. In them, no more than in him, is the beautiful detached or separable from the true and the good ; it is never any thing but one phase of what under another aspect is good, and under still another true. The artist must imitate nature, and he fails just in proportion as he fails to realize the true and the good in his productions. His productions must be fitted to satisfy man in his integrity. We have reason and will, as well as imagination ; and when we contemplate a work of art, we do it as reasonable and moral as well as imaginative beings, and we are dissatisfied with it, if it fail to satisfy us under the relation of reason or will, as much as if it fail to satisfy us under that of the imagination.

Moreover, the beauty which the artist seeks to embody is objective, not subjective, — an emanation from God, not something in or projected from the human soul. Mr. Emerson and the Transcendentalists contend that beauty is something real, but they make it purely ideal. With them, it is not something which exists out of man and independent of him, and therefore something which he objectively beholds and contemplates, but something in man himself, dependent solely on his own in-

ternal state, and his manner of seeing himself and the world around him. But the ideal and the real are not identical; and if the beautiful were the projection or creation of the human soul, and dependent on our internal state and manner of seeing, it would be variable, one thing with one man and another thing with another, one thing this moment, another the next. We should have no criterion of taste, no standard of criticism; art would cease to have its laws; and the boasted science of æsthetics, so highly prized by Transcendentalists, and on which they pride themselves, would be only a dream. Beauty is no more individual, subjective, than is truth or goodness. It neither proceeds from nor is addressed to what is individual, idiosyncratic; but it proceeds from the universal and permanent, and appeals to what, in a degree, is common to all men, and inseparable and indistinguishable from the essential nature of man.

Mr. Emerson's poems, therefore, fail in all the higher requisites of art. They embody a doctrine essentially false, a morality essentially unsound, and at best a beauty which is partial, individual. To be able to regard them as embodying the beautiful, in any worthy sense of the term, one must cease to be what he is, must divest himself of his own individuality, and that not to fall back on our common humanity, but to become Mr. Emerson, and to see only after his peculiar manner of seeing. They are addressed, not to all men, but to a school, a peculiar school, a very small school, composed of individuals who, by nature or education, have similar notions, tastes, and idiosyncrasies. As artistic productions, then, notwithstanding they indicate, on the part of their author, poetical genius of the highest order, they can claim no elevated rank. The author's genius is cramped, confined, and perverted by his false philosophy and morality, and the best thing we can say of his poems is, that they indicate the longing of his spirit for a truth, a morality, a freedom, a peace, a repose, which he feels and laments he has not.

We know Mr. Emerson; we have shared his generous hospitality, and enjoyed the charms of his conversation; as a friend and neighbour, in all the ordinary relations of social and domestic life, he is one it is not easy to help loving and admiring; and we confess we are loath to say aught severe against him or his works; but his volume of poems is the saddest book we ever read. The author tries to cheer up, tries to smile, but the smile is cold and transitory; it plays an in-

stant round the mouth, but does not come from the heart, or lighten the eyes. He talks of music and flowers, and would fain persuade us that he is weaving garlands of joy ; but beneath them is always to be seen the ghastly and grinning skeleton of death. There is an appearance of calm, of quiet, of repose, and at first sight one may half fancy his soul is as placid, as peaceful, as the unruffled lake sleeping sweetly beneath the summer moonbeams ; but it is the calm, the quiet, the repose of despair. Down below are the troubled waters. The world is no joyous world for him. It is void and without form, and darkness broods over it. True, he bears up against it ; but because he is too proud to complain, and because he believes his lot is that of all men and inevitable. Why break thy head against the massive walls of necessity ? Call your darkness light, and it will be as light — to you. Look the fiend in the face, and he is your friend, — at least, as much of a friend as you can have. Why complain ? Poor brother, thou art nothing, or thou art all. Crouch and whine, and thou art nothing ; stand up erect on thy own two feet, and scorn to ask for aught beyond thyself, and thou art all. Yet this stoical pride and resolve require a violent effort, and bring no peace, no consolation, to the soul. In an evil hour, the author overheard what the serpent said to Eve, and believed it ; and from that time, it would seem, he became unable to believe aught else. He loves and wooes nature, for he fancies her beauty and loveliness emanate from the divinity of his own being ; and he affects to walk the fields and the woods, as a god surveying his own handiwork. It is he that gives the rose its fragrance, the rainbow its tints, the golden sunset its gorgeous hues. But the illusion does not last. He feels, after all, that he is a man, only a man ; and the enigma of his own being,

> " The fate of the man-child,
> The meaning of man,"

torments him, and from his inmost soul cries out, and in no lullaby tones, for a solution. But, alas ! no solution comes ; or, if one, it is a solution which solves nothing, which brings no light, no repose, to the spirit wearied with its questionings. As a proof of this, take the poem with which the volume opens, entitled *The Sphinx*. In this the author proposes and attempts to solve the problem of man. He begins by chanting the peace, harmony, and loveliness of external nature, and proceeds : —

" ' But man crouches and blushes,
Absconds and conceals;
He creepeth and peepeth,
He palters and steals;
Infirm, melancholy,
Jealous glancing around,
An oaf, an accomplice,
He poisons the ground.

" ' Outspoke the great mother,
Beholding his fear; —
At the sound of her accents
Cold shuddered the sphere: —
" Who has drugged my boy's cup?
Who has mixed my boy's bread?
Who, with sadness and madness,
Has turned the man-child's head? " '

" I heard a poet answer,
Aloud and cheerfully,
' Say on, sweet Sphinx! thy dirges
Are pleasant songs to me.
Deep love lieth under
These pictures of time;
They fade in the light of
Their meaning sublime.

" ' The fiend that man harries
Is love of the Best;
Yawns the pit of the Dragon,
Lit by rays from the Blest.
The Lethe of nature
Can't trance him again,
Whose soul sees the Perfect,
Which his eyes seek in vain.

" ' Profounder, profounder,
Man's spirit must dive;
To his aye-rolling orbit
No goal will arrive;
The heavens that now draw him
With sweetness untold,
Once found, — for new heavens
He spurneth the old.

" ' Pride ruined the angels,
Their shame them restores;

And the joy that is sweetest
Lurks in stings of remorse.
Have I a lover
Who is noble and free? —
I would he were nobler
Than to love me.

" ' Eterne alternation,
Now follows, now flies;
And under pain, pleasure, —
Under pleasure, pain lies.
Love works at the centre,
Heart-heaving alway;
Forth speed the strong pulses
To the borders of day.

" ' Dull Sphinx, Jove keep thy five wits!
Thy sight is growing blear;
Rue, myrrh, and cummin for the Sphinx, —
Her muddy eyes to clear!' —
The old Sphinx bit her thick lip, —
Said, ' Who taught thee me to name?
I am thy spirit, yoke-fellow,
Of thine eye I am eyebeam.

" ' Thou art the unanswered question;
Couldst see thy proper eye,
Alway it asketh, asketh;
And each answer is a lie.
So take thy quest through nature,
It through thousand natures ply;
Ask on, thou clothed eternity;
Time is the false reply.' " — pp. 9 – 13.

The contrast between moral and physical is founded in fancy. The disorders of the external world are not less striking than those of man, and the strife of elements is as terrible as that of the passions. There are blight and mildew, earthquakes and volcanoes, floods and droughts, in nature, as well as wars and revolutions in states and empires. But let this pass. Whence comes the evil in man? " The fiend that man harries is love of the Best." That is, man is never satisfied with what he has; but imagines that he sees always something better just beyond and above him. Advance or ascend as he may, the Ideal floats ever before him, urging him on, and bidding him climb higher up, ever higher up yet.

There is no rest for him. What is good and what is evil in his condition spring alike from this aspiring disposition. In this originate his virtues, and in this his vices, — what is noblest in his being and character, and what is lowest and meanest; and his sorrow is at the distance there is ever between his aspirations and his realizations. But in this the author confounds the love of the Best, or aspiration to the Perfect, with pride. He teaches, and consciously, that Satan in aspiring to be God was actuated by love of the Best, and therefore holds, — what his disciples do not hesitate to preach, — that Satan has been greatly wronged, and that the sin for which he was cast out of heaven and down to hell, and bound in chains of darkness for ever, was only the pure aspiration of a noble nature after a higher perfection! "Pride ruined the angels, their shame them restores." Indeed, their ruin was no ruin, but a stage in their progress, — "And the joy that is sweetest lurks in the stings of remorse."

But pride and the love of the Best are not identical. Pride is the perversion of the love of the Best, and consists in believing one's self already perfect, not in seeking after a perfection not yet possessed. Lucifer did not rebel because he would be more perfect than he was, but because such was his lofty estimate of himself that he would acknowledge no being as his superior. This is the essential nature of pride. It believes itself to be the highest, and places all else below itself. The basis of love of the Best is humility, and humility springs from a consciousness of our own defects, and the reverent contemplation of the superior merits of others, — a deep and living conviction that there is a Being above us whom we are to love and obey, honor and exalt. Pride would usurp the perfect, — humility would love, reverence, and glorify it; pride would possess it to exalt and glorify itself, — humility for the sake of glorifying Him who is perfect. Humility loves perfection itself with a pure, disinterested love; while pride loves it only for the sake of self, and therefore loves only self, and not perfection at all. The sorrow of pride flows from the mortification of being compelled to admit that there are others which occupy positions above it; the sorrow of humility is that it can never worthily love and reverence, honor and exalt, the good and perfect God as it feels he deserves; but, unlike that of pride, it is a sorrow which has its own consolations, and which is compatible with inexpressible internal peace and joy. The love of the Best, a love which is not the love of

self, but really love of the Best, is no "fiend that man harries"; it breeds no disorder, occasions no fall, no vice, no strife, but bears man onward and upward to God, his true beginning and end.

But, mistaking pride for love of the Best, Mr. Emerson makes it the glory of our nature; and as pride knows no peace so long as it sees aught above it, he teaches that we must always be harried, that we must run ever, but never attain our goal. The Best dances ever before us, and above our reach. It is always farther on, and higher up, and as man ascends, he sees new

> "Hills peep o'er hills, and Alps on Alps arise."

The West recedes the farther from the weary emigrant the farther he travels.

> "To his aye-rolling orbit no goal will arrive,
> The heavens that now draw him with sweetness untold,
> Once found,—for new heavens he spurneth the old."

Each height is scorned as soon as gained, and man must be ever the child who, as soon as you give him one bawble, throws it away and cries for another.

> "Couldst see thy proper eye,
> Alway it asketh, asketh;
> *And each answer is a lie.*
> So take thy quest through nature,
> It through thousand natures ply;
> Ask on, thou clothed eternity;
> Time is the false reply."

There is no remedy, no hope. Each new solution, as soon as obtained, ceases to be true. The answer to the question from one height discloses a height which is higher yet, from which it becomes a lie. There is no truth for us. The truth in the valley is falsehood on the mountain; the truth to-day is falsehood to-morrow. Thus are we, thus must we be, "ever learning, never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." Ever does the secret intense longing for an unseen something spur us onward, upward from height to height, and ever must continue the same evils, the same vices, the same crimes, the same misery and wretchedness, — endless motion, and yet no advance.

> "Eterne alternation, now follows, now flies,
> And under pain, pleasure,—under pleasure pain lies."

What more sad and gloomy? In our very virtues lie and germinate the seeds of our vices; and what is lowest, meanest in us springs from what is purest, noblest, best. And this is man's normal order, the glory of his being, the source of joy and gladness! No change, no deliverance, no day of pleasure without pain, of joy without sorrow, of virtue without vice, of love without hatred, of light without darkness, life without death, is ever to come, to be hoped for, or even desired! And this is the gospel of the nineteenth century, preached in this good city of Boston, by one of the most gifted and loving of our countrymen, who has himself once worn the garb of a professed minister of Him who died that man might live! O my brother, how low hast thou fallen! The old heathens themselves might shame thee. Their Islands of the Blest, nay, their dark Tartarean gulf, were a relief to thy cold and desolating philosophy. Warble no more such music in our ears. We would rather hear the ravings of the wildest fanaticism, or the mutterings of the foulest superstition.

We have never read any thing more heart-rending than the poem entitled *Threnody*. It is, indeed, a lamentation, and the saddest part is the consolation it offers. It is no imaginary lament. The author speaks in his own character, his own grief over the early death of his own son, — a son of rare sweetness and promise. It was a lovely boy, one a father might well love, and be pardoned for weeping. The grief is natural. The stern pride of the father gives way to it, and the stoic becomes wild, all but frantic, and blasphemes nature, his only god after himself.

> " Step the meek birds where erst they ranged;
> The wintry garden lies unchanged;
> The brook into the stream runs on;
> But the deep-eyed boy is gone.
> On that shaded day,
> Dark with more clouds than tempests are,
> When thou didst yield thy innocent breath
> In birdlike heavings unto death,
> Night came, and Nature had not thee;
> I said, ' We are mates in misery.'
> The morrow dawned with needless glow;
> Each snowbird chirped, each fowl must crow;
> Each tramper started; but the feet
> Of the most beautiful and sweet
> Of human youth had left the hill
> And garden, — they were bound and still.

There 's not a sparrow or a wren,
There 's not a blade of autumn grain,
Which the four seasons do not tend,
And tides of life and increase lend;
And every chick of every bird,
And weed and rock-moss is preferred.
O ostrich-like forgetfulness!
O loss of larger in the less!
*Was there no star that could be sent,*
*No watcher in the firmament,*
*No angel from the countless host*
*That loiters round the crystal coast,*
*Could stoop to heal that only child,*
Nature's sweet marvel undefiled,
And keep the blossom of the earth,
Which all her harvests were not worth?
Not mine, — I never called thee mine,
But Nature's heir, — if I repine,
And seeing rashly torn and moved
Not what I made, but what I loved,
Grow early old with grief that thou
Must to the wastes of Nature go, —
'T is because a general hope
Was quenched, and all must doubt and grope.
For flattering planets seemed to say
This child should ills of ages stay,
By wondrous tongue, and guided pen,
Bring the flown Muses back to men.
Perchance not he, but Nature, ailed, —
The world, and not the infant, failed.
It was not ripe yet to sustain
A genius of so fine a strain,
Who gazed upon the sun and moon
As if he came unto his own,
And, pregnant with his grander thought,
Brought the old order into doubt.
His beauty once their beauty tried;
They could not feed him, and he died,
And wandered backward as in scorn,
To wait an æon to be born.
Ill day which made this beauty waste,
Plight broken, this high face defaced!
Some went and came about the dead;
And some in books of solace read;
Some to their friends the tidings say;
Some went to write, some went to pray;

One tarried here, there hurried one;
But their heart abode with none.
Covetous death bereaved us all,
To aggrandize one funeral.
The eager fate which carried thee
Took the largest part of me:
For this losing is true dying;
This is lordly man's down-lying,
This his slow but sure reclining,
Star by star his world resigning.

"O child of paradise,
Boy who made dear his father's home,
In whose deep eyes
Men read the welfare of the times to come,
I am too much bereft.
The world dishonored thou hast left.
O truth's and nature's costly lie!
O trusted broken prophecy!
O richest fortune sourly crossed!
Born for the future, to the future lost!"

— pp. 240 – 244.

How different is this from the temper which the Christian father would have exhibited at the grave of his son cut down in early morning! He too might have wept, but he would not have been desolate; and a joy would have mingled with his grief, and turned it to gladness. He would not have felt that his child was lost to him or to nature; that a bright existence had been blotted out, a sun extinguished and gone to the wastes of nature; but he would have looked upon his boy's death-day as his birthday, and rejoiced that he was so soon removed from the evil, so soon permitted to return from his exile, to be received to his home, and permitted to behold the face of his Heavenly Father, and there in fulness of love and joy, by his prayers and intercessions, obtain new graces for the dear earthly parents whose term of exile had not yet expired. For nature, for the "flown Muses," for the mysteries to be unlocked for the race, for the glorious future the boy-sage was to usher in, he would have felt no uneasiness; because he would have known that the boy in heaven could effect more than the boy on earth; because there has been given to the world the Babe of Bethlehem; and because, as the German proverb says, "The old God still lives," and can take care of nature and of man.

But the author checks the wildness of his grief, and in his excessive charity directs us to the sources of his consolation. But here he is sadder to us than in his grief. Here all becomes sombre and dark, vague and misty, and — what is rarely the case with Mr. Emerson — words, words with no distinct meaning, with scarcely any meaning at all. The verse flows on, but the sense stands still. The father's heart recoils from the pit of annihilation; the proud, unbelieving philosopher scorns to yield to the sweet hope of immortality. The father shrinks with horror from the thought that his bright-eyed boy is lost for ever; the Transcendentalist disdains to believe in an uprising of the dead. What, then, shall he say? What hope can he indulge, what solace dare trust? The bright-eyed boy is not all extinguished. What was elemental in him could not die, and he lives absorbed in the Infinite, as the drop in the ocean!

" Wilt thou not ope thy heart to know
What rainbows teach, and sunsets show?
Verdict which accumulates
From lengthening scroll of human fates,
Voice of earth to earth returned,
Prayers of saints that inly burned, —
Saying, *What is excellent,*
*As God lives, is permanent;*
*Hearts are dust, hearts' loves remain;*
*Heart's love will meet thee again.*
Revere the Maker; fetch thine eye
Up to his style, and manners of the sky.
Not of adamant and gold
Built he heaven stark and cold;
No, but a nest of bending reeds,
Flowering grass, and scented weeds;
Or like a traveller's fleeing tent,
Or bow above the tempest bent;
Built of tears and sacred flames,
And virtue reaching to its aims;
Built of furtherance and pursuing,
Not of spent deeds, but of doing.
Silent rushes the swift Lord
Through ruined systems still restored,
Broad-sowing, bleak and void to bless,
Plants with worlds the wilderness;
Waters with tears of ancient sorrow
Apples of Eden ripe to-morrow.

*House and tenant go to ground,*
*Lost in God, in Godhead found.*" — pp. 248, 249.

"Heart's love will meet thee again." Yes, love without the loving heart, love without a lover! O my brother, is this all thy consolation? Is this

"What rainbows teach, and sunsets show?"

Nay, most desolate father, not rainbows or sunsets taught thee this; it was the moon, the moon, fickle goddess of the night; for no man not moonstruck would talk of hearts' loves remaining when hearts are no more. Thou consolest thyself with a vain shadow, nay, not so much as a shadow, but a very absurdity, a sheer impossibility; for whoever heard of heart's love without the loving heart, any more than of thought without a thinker, or act without an actor? Thou boastest thyself wise, thou makest the "great Heart" say to thee,

"But thou, my votary, weepest thou?
I gave thee sight, — where is it now?
*I taught thy heart beyond the reach*
*Of ritual, bible, or of speech;*
*Wrote in thy mind's transparent table,*
*As far as the incommunicable;*
*Taught thee each private sign to raise,*
*Lit by the supersolar blaze.*
Past utterance, and past belief,
And past the blasphemy of grief,
The mysteries of Nature's heart;
And though no Muse can these impart,
Throb thine with Nature's throbbing breast,
And all is clear from east to west." — pp. 245, 246.

And yet thou here revivest the old Hindu dream, stripped of its self-coherence, reduced to an absurdity so palpable that the veriest child can detect it; and this thou claspest as a spiritual balsam to thy torn and bleeding heart, and wouldst gravely persuade us that it is a sovereign remedy, that it heals thy wound and makes thee whole, a man, a hale and joyous man again. "Hearts are dust, hearts' loves remain," — remain when hearts are no more! O my brother, how true it is, that when we turn our back on God and his word, esteem ourselves wise, and boast that we have been taught

"Beyond the reach
Of ritual, Bible, or of speech,"

we become — fools! Thou art a man of rare gifts, and thou

hast studied long and much, thou hast questioned the past and the present, the living and the dead, the stars and the flowers, the fields and the groves, the winds and the waves, the day and the night, and thou hast a keen, penetrating glance, and thou hast a warm, sympathetic soul, and yet thou art solitary in thick darkness ; thou seest not the plainest things under thy very nose, thou seest not clearly even thy hand before thee. There is a bright and glorious universe around thee, full of light, love, and gladness, of which thou dreamest not ; angels hover round thee and fan thee with their soft breath, and thou feelest them not ; angel voices call to thee, in sweet music that trances the soul, but thou hearest them not ; and because thou art blind, and deaf, and insensible, in thy foolish pride thou deniest what to every faith-illumined eye is as clear as the sun in the heavens, and to every faith-opened heart as distinct and dear as voice of lover or of friend.

Alas ! we are not ignorant of the blindness and deafness of those who are without faith, or of the strange illusion which makes us obstinately persist that we both see and hear. There is something weird and mysterious in the thoughts and feelings which come to us, unbidden, when we leave faith behind, and fix our gaze intently upon ourselves as upon some magic mirror. The circle of our vision seems to be enlarged ; darkness is transformed to light ; worlds open upon worlds ; we send keen, penetrating glances into the infinite abyss of being ; the elements grow obedient to us, work with us and for us, and we seem to be strong with their strength, terrible with their might, and to approach and to become identical with the Source of all things. God becomes comprehensible and communicable, and we live an elemental life, and burn with elemental fire. The universe flows into us and from us. We control the winds, the waves, the rivers and the tides, the stars and the seasons. We teach the plant when to germinate, to blossom, or ripen, the reed when to bend before the blast, and the lightning when to rive the hoary oak. Alas ! we think not then that this is all delusion, and that we are under the influence of the Fallen Angel, who would persuade us that darkness is light, that weakness is strength, that hell is heaven, and himself God. Under a similar influence and delusion labors the author of these poems. There are passages in them which recall all too vividly what we, in our blindness and unbelief, have dreamed, but rarely ventured to utter. We know

these poems; we understand them. They are not sacred chants; they are hymns to the devil. Not God, but Satan, do they praise, and they can be relished only by devil-worshipers.

Yet we do not despair of our poet. He has a large share of *religiosity*, and his soul needs to prostrate itself before God and adore. There is a low, sad music in these poems, deep and melodious, which escapes the author unbidden, and which discloses a spirit ill at ease, a heart bewailing its bondage, and a secret, intense longing to burst its chains, and to soar aloft to the heaven of divine love and freedom. This music is the echo of the angel voices still pleading with him, and entreating him to return from his wanderings, to open his eyes to the heaven which lies around him, his ears to the sweet voices which everywhere are chanting the praises of God. We must hope that ere long he will, through grace, burst the Satanic cords which now bind him, open his eyes to the sweet vision of beauty that awaits him, and his ears to the harmony which floats on every breeze. Bear with me; nature never intended thee for an Indian Gymnosophist or a heartless Stoic. Thou art a man, with a warm, gushing human heart, and thou wast made to love and adore. Say, Get behind me, Satan! to the vain philosophizing you have indulged; have the courage to say you have been wrong, open your heart to the light of heaven as the sunflower opens her bosom to the genial rays of the sun, and thy spirit will be free, thy genius will no longer be imprisoned, and thy heart will find what it sighs after, and wail no more. One who was as proud as thyself, and who had wandered long in the paths thou art beating, and whose eye was hardly less keen than thy own, and who knew by heart all thy mystic lore, and had as well as thou pored over the past and the present, as well as thou had asked

> "The fate of the man-child,
> The meaning of man,"—

and had asked the heavens and the earth, the living and the dead, and, in his madness, hell itself, to answer him, and whose soul was not less susceptible to sweet harmonies than thy own, though his tones were harsh and his speech rude, — nay, one who knows all thy delusions and illusions, assures thee that thou shalt not in this be deceived, and thy confidence will not be misplaced or betrayed.